DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 337 780 CS 213 021

AUTHOR Roberts, Doralyn R.; Langer, Judith A.
TITLE Supporting the Process of Literary Understanding: Analysis of a Classroom Discussion. Report Series 2.15.
INSTITUTION Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature, Albany, NY.
SPONS AGENCY National Endowment for the Arts, Washington, D.C.; Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 91
CONTRACT G008720278; RI17G10015
NOTE 73p.; Portions contain small print.
AVAILABLE FROM Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature, 1400 Washington Ave., ED B-9, SUNY/Albany, Albany, NY 12222.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Classroom Communication; Classroom Research; *Discussion (Teaching Technique); Grade 7; Junior High Schools; *Literature Appreciation; Middle Schools; Student Reaction; *Teacher Student Relationship
IDENTIFIERS *Response to Literature; Scaffolding

ABSTRACT

A study analyzed in detail one 37-minute classroom literature discussion to better understand how to foster students' critical reasoning. It investigated the characteristics of classroom interactions that support students in the process of responding to literature, the roles of the participants, and how the teacher can structure the tasks and use language to help students begin with their own initial responses and move beyond, to deeper understanding. Twenty-six seventh-grade English students participated in the discussion. The discussion was then analyzed by segmenting the transcript into turns and then into topics, and speakers' interactions were coded to identify the purposes which lay behind each speaker's turn. Then the broader patterns across the whole discussion were examined to note the patterns of participation and control, the roles played by teacher and students, and the ways in which instructional scaffolding worked in the discussion. Results illustrated how the process of understanding developed through social interaction, and shows that the role of the teacher was crucial in accomplishing this. Results also showed that a heterogeneous class of students with differing reading levels can function well when involved in a group discussion. Results additionally demonstrated the five elements of effective instructional scaffolding that contributed to the success of this discussion: ownership, appropriateness of the instructional task, structure, collaboration, and internalization. (Six tables of data and 34 references are attached.) (PRA)

ED337780

# Supporting the Process of Literary Understanding: Analysis of a Classroom Discussion

Doralyn R. Roberts
Judith A. Langer

Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature
University at Albany
State University of New York
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

Report Series 2.15

1991

CS213021

Preparation of this report was supported in part by grant number G008720278, which is cosponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI/ED), and by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), and by grant number R117G10015, which is sponsored by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI/ED). However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of OERI/ED or NEA, and no official endorsement of either agency should be inferred.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning

The National Research Center on Literature Teaching and Learning is a research and development center located at the University at Albany, State University of New York. The Center was established in 1987 (as the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature), and in January 1991 began a new, five-year cycle of work sponsored by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education. The Center's mission is to conduct research and sponsor activities to improve the teaching of literature, preschool through grade 12, in schools across the nation.

Center-sponsored research falls into three broad areas: teaching and learning processes, curriculum and assessment, and social and cultural traditions in the teaching and learning of literature. Special attention is given to the role of literature in the teaching and learning of students at risk for school failure, and to the development of higher-level literacy skills, literary understanding, and critical thinking skills in all students.

For information on current publications and activities, write to: Literature Center, School of Education, University at Albany, 1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, NY 12222.

# Supporting the Process of Literary Understanding: Analysis of a Classroom Discussion

Doralyn R. Roberts
Judith A. Langer
University at Albany
State University of New York

In one strand of studies at the Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature we have been looking at the nature of classroom practices underlying literature instruction that support students' understanding and their development of critical thinking abilities. We have learned that there are characteristic ways in which students make sense of literary pieces (Langer, 1989, 1990a) and that the role of the teacher is central to the ways they think and talk about their understandings and interpretations of the pieces they read (Langer, 1990b, 1991).

This report presents an analysis of one literature discussion, in which students are thoughtfully involved in developing, supporting, analyzing, and enriching their own interpretations. Because this lesson involves a teacher who is inviting and supporting students in their efforts to reach their own understandings and students who are responding in ways that evidence their own thoughtful engagement with the piece, it is unlike traditional lessons (Langer & Applebee 1987; Applebee 1989) where the teacher holds the correct interpretations and the students attempt to understand them. We undertook this analysis to better understand the teacher's role in lessons that foster the development of students' critical reasoning -- the ways in which the teacher functions when supporting students in their processes of understanding, and the students' roles as partners in the interactions. It provides us with the details to more clearly specify the productive ways in which class discussion can lead to collaborative refinements of understandings. We can see how individual students, as well as the teacher, provide ideas and model ways to think about them in a manner that moves the conversation along and enriches the growing interpretations.

## Related Studies

A review of the literature on studies dealing with the influence of the instructional context on readers' responses to literary texts (particularly those which employ some systematic analyses of those responses) indicates that while some attention has been given to the ways in which the organization and control of the classroom affects students' literary responses, few studies beyond Barnes' (1976) classic study of classroom communication have focused on how the language and purposes in classroom interactions support students' literary responding and reasoning, although Rosenblatt's work (1938) has long provided an important starting place. A number of studies have looked at types of classroom contexts that affect students' responses and the forms these responses take. For example, McPhail (1979) found that a peer group of seven- to nine-year-olds produced more complex speech and interacted more freely about their understandings, than when they were in a group dominated by an adult. Similarly, tenth-graders became highly dependent on the questioning strategies used by their teacher, never seeing their own interpretations as critical to the discussion (Fisher, 1985).

Teacher discussion practices also affect the extent to which students act as an interpretive community, collaborating to expand the range and depth of their responses. Miller (1988), studying instruction in high school English classes, found that when a teacher treated a text as if it had only one meaning, both critical thinking and discussion were limited, while the active probing style of another teacher led students to question texts and evaluate their beliefs. A third teacher's style was judged to be the most successful in developing an interpretive community. This teacher modeled being a reflective reader, enforced group cooperation, and encouraged students' questioning of texts and each other. In a related study at the intermediate grade level, McClure (1985) described the manner in which a teacher's support for higher level responses was achieved by sanctioning peer interaction and experimentation and by providing praise and feedback, acknowledgment of frustration, clear behavioral expectations, and flexibility in time and space. In contrast, Alvermann and Hayes (1989) found that in classrooms where both the students and teachers treated discussion as recitation, with the teacher possessing the "right" answers, meaning was constructed within the teacher's frame of reference and the students rarely questioned that meaning or initiated questions. Marshall (1987) described a similar kind of classroom interaction in which a teacher, seeking a relatively rigorous level of analysis, provided so much instructional support that she appropriated the task of literary analysis from her students although she did not mean to do so.

What counts as appropriate response and the ways to make those responses are conveyed by the teacher during day-to-day interactions in a classroom. This is accomplished through negotiation and through verbal and nonverbal modeling of practices the teacher considers appropriate. Ultimately, students internalize these preferred ways and make them part of their own responding practices. For example, Purves (1981), in a study of literature teaching in Grades 8-12 in 10 countries, found that as students progressed through secondary school, their responses increasingly corresponded to those of their teachers. In a related body of work, Hickman (1980, 1983) studied effects of a teacher's direct teaching and indirect modeling on the responses of children in Grades K-5. Across the grades, teachers' behaviors directed students toward what to look for in literature, strategies to use in discussion, when to make comparisons, and how to focus attention. The greatest amount of talk and the most varied reaction occurred in response to books which the teacher had shared with the students. Roser and Martinez (1985) found similar patterns in preschoolers' responses to the oral reading of literature, reporting that they tended to mirror the responses of the adults around them. These adults functioned as co-responders, who modeled the response process, and as informers and monitors who explained aspects of the stories, provided information, voiced the importance of making connections and sense from the print, and assessed and checked for understanding. They also directed storytime by managing the discussion.

These studies indicate that the type of social organization and control in the classroom and the character of teacher direction all influence the amount, complexity, and comprehensiveness of student response. The studies also make clear that student responses are influenced by the particular ways in which questions are posed. While these findings contribute to our understandings of some factors that need to be addressed in linking literature instruction and critical thought, the studies do not give us a clear picture of how those factors function in classrooms. They show us that the context created by the teacher influences student responses, but they do not provide specification of the context itself. Thus, specific suggestions for instruction remain elusive.

**Purpose of Study**

For the past three years we have been conducting a series of studies (Langer 1989; 1990a,b; Close 1990) to understand better the underlying principles of instruction and interaction in classrooms where students function as active literary thinkers -- where they explore possibilities in the reading and discussion of literature, where they learn to become critical readers who can develop and support their own interpretations of what they read, and where they also learn how to use the comments and reactions of others to rethink, enrich, and elaborate upon their own understandings. Langer (1991) has identified six characteristics of such instruction which differentiate it from the more traditional teacher-dominated discussion: the students are treated as thinkers, as if they can and do have something interesting to share about the piece they have read; literature reading is treated as question-generating, and thus it is expected that students will have questions (rather than only answers) after reading; when content questions are asked, they tap the students' understandings rather than externally sanctioned facts; class meeting time is devoted to furthering the students' understandings, rather than evaluating and reviewing; the teacher's role is to scaffold the students' own attempts to understand; and support is provided only when necessary so that students can learn to engage in thoughtful literary reading and discussions on their own. Thus, the underlying culture of such classes calls for and expects the active and thoughtful participation of the students, and provides them with the help to learn to do so. While we have come to understand ways in which the role of the teacher and the role of the students are collaborative and inquisitive in such situations, we also wish to specify the nature of the interactions that move group thinking along and serve instructive purposes.

To begin to provide such detail, the present report provides a detailed analysis of the interactions which occurred during one classroom discussion of a literary piece, in which the students engaged in the process of literary understanding (see Langer, 1989, 1990a for a discussion of literary understanding) by pondering possibilities, exploring alternative meanings, and expanding and enriching their interpretations.

In this study, we were guided by the following questions: What are the characteristics of classroom interaction that support students in the process of responding to literature? What are the roles of the participants? How can the teacher structure the tasks and use language to help students begin with their own initial responses and move beyond, to deeper understandings?

**The Study**

The literature lesson analyzed here was taught during the second year of the project described above. Using what was learned in the first year of the study concerning the ways students approach, read, and make sense of literary texts (Langer, 1989, 1990a,b), four university-based researchers who were all experienced teachers of English, collaborated with eight secondary English teachers, in urban and suburban schools, to plan and study lessons designed to support students' more thoughtful engagement with literature. Across the year, five instructional episodes were planned and carried out in each class, each with the overall goal of supporting students' problem solving and reasoning about the pieces they read. The instructional episodes involved goals, activities, and materials that complied with the participating school

districts' curricula, but were shaped to focus on moving students toward more critically reasoned ways of understanding literature. Because each episode represented an instructional "whole" that the teacher planned to be experienced as a cohesive unit (e.g., sometimes around a single novel, sometimes around a theme uniting the reading of several poems, a play, and a short story), they ranged from approximately one week to one month in duration. In particular, the research looked at the activities within and across each instructional episode (and later across episodes), focusing on the ways in which the students engaged in the processes of literary understanding and the characteristics of instruction that supported such reasoning.

During the course of data collection, which involved collaborative planning, unstructured interviews with the teachers and students, and nonparticipant observation in each classroom studied (see Langer, 1991), the videotape of the lesson analyzed in this study was made.

*The Context*

The lesson occurred during the spring, after the teacher and her heterogeneously grouped seventh-grade English class in a suburban middle school had been involved in the larger study for about six months. Barbara, who had been teaching English in this school for about 21 years and was considered an excellent teacher by district administrators, her colleagues and her students, had volunteered to become part of our multiyear collaborative project. Barbara was interested in continuing to rethink her own approaches to literature instruction and wanted to become involved in developing activities that supported students' critical thinking and active reasoning about literature.

The students had agreed to participate in the project either as students whose lessons we observed and recorded (using fieldnotes and occasional audio and videotapes) and whose work we collected and copied for analysis, or as case study students who also participated in tape-recorded interviews. During the interviews, they were asked about their thoughts and approaches to the pieces being studied and their perceptions of the activities themselves, as well as their perceptions of the instructional goals. Because the class was heterogeneously grouped, the students' academic achievement varied from approximately three years above to three years below grade level, and three students regularly were assigned to remedial reading class.

This class was chosen because it is a good example of one in which the students' ideas were valued; in this particular lesson they were involved in exploring the horizon of possibilities, not in trying to figure out the teacher's predetermined answers to her own questions. This discussion was one in a series about the book being read; it was neither the first nor the last. It did not move toward consensus -- either a collaboratively agreed upon or an externally sanctioned interpretation -- but instead explored the students' concerns and issues, weaving in and out of topics as students worked through their own understandings.

It was also a good example of an instructional environment where the social fabric supported student thinking -- helping students to question, evaluate, and reach their own interpretations. Neither the students nor the teacher functioned earlier in the year as they did in this lesson. By this point in the year the teacher had moved from standing in front of the room, to sitting in a large circle with her students, and from imposing her own agenda on discussions and insisting on only text-based support, to allowing students to pursue their own

meaning-making agendas, drawing upon their own experiences and other reading experiences in the process (Close 1990). Thus, in this lesson, students were given room to think through and reach their own interpretations, as well as to hear and challenge others' interpretations. Across the year, the students had also evolved -- from restrained talkers to active discussants, from responding to teacher questions to initiating their own questions, and from dependency on teacher evaluation to assuming ownership for the growth and relevance of their own ideas.

The particular lesson was chosen because the question-response-evaluate pattern of communication so prevalent in usual classroom dialogue (Mehan, 1979; Applebee 1989) was missing, and the students did not display their knowledge for a teacher, who comes to a lesson with expected responses already in mind. In this lesson, the teacher kept things going both by orchestrating the turn-taking and by raising the level of the task being undertaken at various points during the lesson, but she did not present them with a predetermined interpretation of the piece they were discussing. The teacher took an active role in the lesson, but it was one of support rather than domination.

*Procedures*

As part of the project, Barbara participated in weekly meetings during the fall semester, at which time the entire project team (eight teachers, four research assistants and the project director) discussed findings of the earlier studies on literary understanding, reviewed related literature, and discussed ongoing attempts to support students' processes of understanding. Since this was part of a naturalistic case study, the pieces the students read were those ordinarily used by Barbara. Her usual curriculum was followed, with changes in instruction being made as attempts to enhance her students' developing understandings. Across the year, Barbara and the research assistant with whom she collaborated planned five instructional episodes (generally taking several weeks each). Case study methodology was used and Barbara's class was a case unto itself, with two case study students being treated as cases within the case. In this way, we were able to trace the interactions between teacher and students, as well as between student and students across instructional episodes in an attempt to identify characteristics of instruction that underlay the many lessons that supported literary understanding (reported in Langer 1991), and also to examine closely the interactions and intentions within the one lesson reported here.

*The Lesson*

Of the 26 students in class on that day, three chose not to be videotaped and were sitting out of the camera's range. All students were told that they did not have to talk if they did not want to talk. Of the 23 who were on camera, 17 students participated actively in the discussion. The transcription was made using both the videotape and a simultaneously recorded back-up audiotape. Both the teacher and the university researcher assigned to this class for the year confirmed the accuracy of the transcription.

On the days prior to this lesson, students had spent four class periods on the novel, The Girl Who Owned a City, by O. T. Nelson (1975). Similar in theme to Lord of the Flies, it is about a city ruled by children after everyone over the age of 12 mysteriously dies. Lisa is the girl who becomes leader, and the story involves the problems and situations she faces. The

teacher started with the whole class together and then gave them instructions for how they were to function in small groups on several designated days. Each student had a list of items, including questions for group work, in the event they did not come up with their own, and a calendar with final dates when certain things should be completed. The groups had control of the reading assignments and their own discussions. When the lesson analyzed here occurred, they had read the whole book and discussed it in their groups and in the whole class. They had been keeping literature journals and had discussed their in-process thoughts and questions in small groups, as well as in whole class discussions. This lesson was intended as a time for the whole class to reflect on their responses to the whole book, particularly their envisionments -- their ideas and questions -- when they finished reading. (For a discussion of envisionment see Langer 1985, 1987b, 1990a,b). The students and the teacher were seated in chairs in a circle. One small opening in the circle allowed the videocamera to be placed on the perimeter so that it could pan around the circle. The teacher took notes during the session, recording who spoke, what topics were addressed and when hands went up, indicating that a student wanted to contribute.

This lesson is characterized by high involvement and sustained attention to topics. It was one that seemed to work in terms of our project goals; the students were actively involved in the exploration of possibilities as they questioned and enriched their understandings, and their teacher supported them in doing so.

*Analyses*

Analyses were based on a sociocognitive view of learning (see Langer 1987a, 1989, 1990a, 1991; in press; also Bruner, Goodnow & Austin, 1956; Rogoff, 1990; Wertsch, 1985; Vygotsky 1962, 1978), which holds that learning takes place within a social context in which the interaction supports and extends the learning. What is of special interest in this lesson, from a sociocognitive perspective, is how the social context supports the kinds of thinking that occur. Participants in these interactions function in ways which help the students to extend their own understandings of the piece, to think in deeper and more complex ways, and to make their own judgments about the meaning of the book. The analyses were designed to examine more explicitly how this occurs.

Segmenting the Transcript

To permit analysis of the interactions, the transcript was segmented into turns (233), with the entrance of each speaker marking a new turn. The turns were then separated by topic, with all the contiguous turns focusing on a particular topic grouped together. The 37-minute discussion focused on 22 topics, with 7 of the 22 topics linking back to topics already discussed (see Table 1).

Coding the Interactions

The interactions were coded to identify the purposes which lay behind each speaker's turn. While we began with some notions for categories of language interaction based upon

Table 1

Topic Segments

| Segment | Topic | Initiator of topic |
|---|---|---|
| #1 | Perfect ending vs. problems | Marissa |
| #2 | Ending is not realistic | Sheila |
| #3 | (Recycle) Perfect ending vs. problems | Gerrick |
| #4 | Power in their reputation | Darren |
| #5 | Gun vs. verbal confrontation | Jimmy |
| #6 | Lisa's accomplishment coupled with the dragging on of the story | Don |
| #7 | Author rushed the ending | Kent |
| #8 | (Recycle) Power to the winners | Samantha |
| #9 | (Recycle) The verbal confrontation | Charlene |
| #10 | Ending is boring, goes on and on | Shelia |
| #11 | Ending is unexpected | Betsy |
| #12 | Tom Logan's mistakes | Gerrick |
| #13 | Is the last part needed? | Conrad |
| #14 | (Recycle) Verbal defeat or welcome alternative? | Ann |
| #15 | (Recycle) Author rushed the ending | Darren |
| #16 | Lisa should have died | Sheila |
| #17 | (Recycle) Happy ending or not? | Gep |
| #18 | Responsibility | Kent |
| #19 | (Recycle) Lisa, die or not, in relation to purpose and meaning | Conrad |
| #20 | Has Lisa changed? | Gerrick |
| #21 | Not the way a normal young person would react | Kent |
| #22 | Teacher's summary | Teacher |

mother-child language learning studies (see Langer and Applebee, 1986), the coding categories used were data-driven. Two sets were developed; one level identified the speaker's purposes in the interactions, and the second amplified the first level code "Help" by identifying the specific kinds of help contained in the interaction. We hoped this would permit us to arrive at a more explicit understanding of the nature of supportive instruction and how it operates. Definitions are contained in Table 2.

As a first step, we will examine each of the 22 topically defined segments that mark the progress of the lesson. There will be an extended gloss of the teacher's and students' interactions, complete with a verbatim transcription of each complete segment. For detail, the system of analysis underlying each gloss has been included: the coding categories assigned to each conversational turn for each particular speaker are identified and the additive count of that speaker's comments noted.

This topic-by-topic analysis will be followed by one which looks more broadly across the entire discussion, focusing on the patterns of participation and control, the roles played by the teacher and the students, and the ways in which instructional scaffolding works across the 37 minutes.

We begin with the segment-by-segment analysis.

**Interactions Within Topic Boundaries**

Segment #1: Perfect ending vs. problems. The discussion is initiated by the teacher with a completely open invitation to the students to "talk about" "something" followed by her recognition of Marissa, who begins by introducing the topic of whether or not the ending is "too perfect." The teacher's role in the rest of the segment is limited to orchestrating turn-taking, by recognizing the next participant, and asking two questions containing restatements of students' ideas for the purpose of voicing her understanding of the students' meanings so that the students might confirm or clarify their intended meanings. Both of these patterns of interaction involving the teacher are repeated numerous times throughout this class discussion.

Four students are rapidly involved in a debate about whether the ending was perfect or had problems. The first student claims it is too perfect. The second student disagrees, expands her ideas, and asks the first student a question. The first student responds and the same cycle of debate occurs again. The third student opens by agreeing with the second student and expanding his ideas. A fourth student continues to expand the ideas of the second and third student, and to confirm and expand his ideas when the teacher asks two questions to clarify what he has said.

In this opening segment the teacher did not set the topic of discussion or participate in the debate. All of the ideas in play came from the students, and the teacher only functioned to regulate turn-taking and to clarify for herself and for others what the fourth student was saying.

Table 2

Speakers' Purposes in the Interactions

| Code | Definition |
|---|---|
| Agree: | Speaker agrees with or affirms another's idea. |
| Challenge: | Asking someone (or the class) to consider an alternate view. |
| Check: | Asking someone for clarification of ideas to check out one's own understanding of what that person said. |
| Clarify: | Restating an idea or ideas in an effort to make one's own meaning clear. |
| Confirm: | Accepting the restatement by another of one's own ideas. |
| Disagree: | Disagreeing with another's idea or position. |
| Expand: | Expanding ideas, either one's own or another's. |
| Help: | Offering assistance or scaffolding to move thought along to broader or deeper considerations. |
| Invite: | Giving an open invitation to participate. |
| Orchestrate: | Regulating and facilitating turn-taking through some logistical intervention, including recognizing participants and asking to be heard. |
| Present: | Introducing a topic. |
| Recycle: | Recycling previously discussed topic(s). |
| Restate: | Restating the idea(s) of another for the purpose of voicing one's understanding of another's meaning. May take the form of a question which contains the restated idea(s). |
| Upping the ante: | Asking students to address a more difficult task than they are currently addressing. |

Table 2 (Con't.)

Kinds of Help Given

| Code | Definition |
|---|---|
| Focus: | Focusing attention or narrowing the field of consideration. |
| Hint: | Giving a bit of an idea or answer in an effort to elicit an expected or possible response. |
| Modify/shape: | Changing the idea(s) of another slightly, usually by using different language or adding something, in an attempt to elicit an alteration in the perceptions or ideas that person has voiced. |
| Summarize: | Reviewing or restating ideas which have been stated before by a number of people in order to bring them to everyone's attention. |
| Tell: | Explicit statement of a fact or information for the purpose of establishing it as a given. |

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #1

Note:

T = Teacher

S = Student, numbered in order of appearance in the transcript

The number following the "-" indicates the turn for that person

Example: S4-3 is the third turn for student S4.

T-5 is the teacher's fifth turn. Underlining indicates the word was spoken with emphasis.

Segment #1: Perfect ending vs. problems

| Turn | | Purpose | Speaker |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-1 | Invite<br>Orchestrate | T: | Okay, do we have something that we want to talk about today? All right, Marissa. |
| S1-1 | Present<br>Expand | Marissa: | I didn't like the ending. I thought it was like too perfect. Like she gets the city back and everything's just peachy dandy. I thought something else would happen. It just didn't feel right. |
| T-2 | Orchestrate | T: | Charlene? |
| S2-1 | Disagree<br>Expand<br>Challenge | Charlene: | When you said peachy dandy, it's not peachy dandy, there are tons of problems that she's got to face. I mean, she's got, the problem, what if the gang comes back? |
| S1-2 | Expand | Marissa: | Well, Tom Logan's a wimp! |
| S2-2 | Expand<br>Challenge | Charlene: | Well, you've got to think about it, because when they were going around doing all this other stuff, they heard mention of this other gang called the Chicago Gang I think it was, and what if that gang comes? I mean, they're very, they've got a lot of problems. It's not perfect, nothing is perfect by all means. |
| T-3 | Orchestrate | T: | Conrad? |
| S3-1 | Agree<br>Expand | Conrad: | I agree with Charlene, that it's not really perfect, it is kind of a happy ending, because everyone is all fine. But they are, there's other problems, like, they still have the food problem and all the |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | gangs and stuff, they're kind of use to it, but it's still, it's still a big problem, and it's gonna take a long time to get over this, to get over that problem. |
| T-4 | Orchestrate | T: | Gep? |
| 34-1 | Expand | Gep: | It is a too happy, perfect, it's like they have problems, but they don't have that many problems, like the Chicago Gang doesn't really have that high of a chance of coming. |
| T-5 | Restate | T: | You don't believe that's gonna happen? |
| S4-2 | Confirm Expand | Gep: | No. Because, even if they do, they have a lot of defense. And I think it wouldn't be like that the Chicago Gang would just take them over. They'd still have a defense and stuff. And the food problem, they'd probably overcome after a little while, because they'd get more people thinking than just like Lisa and that group. |
| T-6 | Restate | T: | I'm gonna use the word vulnerable. You don't think they're vulnerable to the Chicago Gang. You think they'll have enough to overcome that. |
| S4-3 | Confirm | Gep: | Yeah. |
| T-7 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila |

Segment #2: Ending is not realistic. A change in topic to exploring ways in which the ending is realistic or not is initiated by a fifth student joining the discussion. This sparks an immediate debate which involves two students already participating and two new participants. The first topic is recycled into the new debate, but the thrust is to consider whether the ending is realistic or not. The students accomplish this by both expanding their own ideas and by challenging their fellow classmates to think about other possible interpretations of the ending, as when Charlene (S2-4) asks, "What about all the other gangs...?" The students' voices dominate. For example, in one portion of this segment, six exchanges by three students are only interrupted once by the teacher (T-11) who says, "One at a time," because the students are rapidly responding to each other and they are all eager to take their turns.

The teacher is involved in several moves to assist the students in focusing on and articulating the "what's" and "why's" of what they were thinking and saying. She helps Kent move away from the dramatics of pointing at the students with whom he disagrees, by asking him to

focus on saying what he was thinking (T-9). When Kent only states an opinion, she ups the ante and asks, "Why?" (T-10), in an effort to get him to give his reasons. Betsy is also attempting to give just an opinion about the ending being "unreal" without saying more. The teacher ups the ante (T-13) as with Kent, but she also offers Betsy some assistance by focusing on "what bothered you about whether it was realistic."

Other involvement by the teacher is minimal. She restates Sheila's ideas (T-8), to ensure that she has understood her meaning and to voice that understanding for the whole class as she did in segment #1, and she gives an open invitation (T-14) to the students to elicit different feelings about the ending.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #2

Segment #2: Ending is not realistic

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S5-1 | Present<br>Expand | Sheila: | I didn't like the ending either. Because it just seemed like towards the ending, I mean at the beginning of the book, Lisa wasn't the only person who, with ideas. But towards the ending, the kids seemed to be like really dumb. And they were just we need Lisa, we can't survive without her. And I just, this is like another topic, sort of, but it goes into this, it seems like that isn't very realistic at all. I mean, I don't see how one person can be smart and have all these ideas, and the rest of them be like, frogs. |
| T-8 | Restate<br>Orchestrate | T: | So you're very unhappy with the idea that there's just one person who seems to be able to pick up this leadership and go, and that's not, to use that word, realistic. Which is another word we've been wanting to talk about. Kent? |
| S6-1 | Disagree | Kent: | I disagree with her, her, her, and her. (Pointing over and over at one person, Charlene.) |
| T-9 | Help: Focus | T: | Let's hear what. |
| S6-2 | Recycle<br>Disagree | Kent: | Because she says everything wasn't so peachy dandy. And I think everything was |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | peachy dandy. |
| T-10 | Upping the ante | T: | Why? |
| S6-3 | Expand | Kent: | Because like, (in a feminine voice like Lisa) "Oh, we get the city back, and Tom Logan leaves us alone." |
| S2-3 | Challenge | Charlene: | What about all the other gangs, and the food? (others are also objecting) |
| S6-4 | Expand | Kent: | The Chicago Gang, who cares about them! |
| S2-4 | Challenge Expand | Charlene: | What about all the other gangs in the city where they use to live? I mean, Tom Logan wasn t the only gang. |
| | | | (Many students are talking at once.) |
| T-11 | Orchestrate | T: | One at a time. |
| S4-4 | Expand | Gep: | After they demolished Tom Logan's gang, a lot of other gangs did not want to mess with them. |
| S2-5 | Challenge Expand | Charlene: | But what happens if the other gangs join up? You know that is possible. |
| T-12 | Orchestrate | T: | O.K., let's go here with Betsy. Betsy? |
| S7-1 | Agree Expand | Betsy: | I sort of agree with Sheila, because the end is like, <u>unreal</u>, okay? Unreal. I'm not gonna say anything. |
| T-13 | Upping the ante Help: Focus | T: | Why? What bothered you about whether it was realistic or not? |
| S7-2 | Expand | Betsy: | I really don't know. But it's like, oh wow, what are you supposed to do now. Oh we're happy, it's like... |
| T-14 | Invite Orchestrate | T: | Is that, do you agree? Does anybody have a <u>different</u> feeling about the ending? Gerrick? |

<u>Segment #3: (Recycle) Perfect ending vs. problems</u>. A recycling of the opening debate occurs when the teacher issues an open invitation (T-14) to the students to share any different

feelings they have about the ending than those already expressed. This results in Gerrick, a new participant, hooking into the initial topic. He then expands the idea of there being many unresolved problems into the observation that perhaps the author meant for things not to be resolved, so that readers would have to use their minds. He also links this to his experience reading another story where the ending occurred abruptly. Further, this student supplies an example of how one might speculate about what happens after the story ends.

The direction of the discussion and the concerns addressed by this student are determined by him and not by the teacher. The teacher's open invitation to the students to extend the range of ideas about the ending, and the limitation of her involvement in clarification and recognition of turn-takers has allowed this. Her uses of a restatement (T-15) of Gerrick's ideas and of a question (T-16) to check her understanding of his position are done with the implicit understanding that it was up to him to clarify or confirm the ideas she voices. Gerrick does this in turns S8-2 and S8-3.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #3

Segment #3: (Recycle) Perfect ending vs. problems

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S8-1 | Recycle<br>Expand<br>Present | Gerrick: | I think the ending was sort of like, the author tried to keep you hanging on so much that, like in other stories, especially like with "Charles" where they cut you off, but he kind of left us hanging just a little bit, so you could let your mind wander, but if you weren't that person, you just trapped the story there, okay, we got the students back fine, but you could let your mind wander, like this is when the food supply runs out, I mean, what are you going to do? Go across the Atlantic Ocean go over to Saudi Arabia and stuff like that, and start pumping up oil? (The concern here is the gasoline.) |
| T-15 | Restate | T: | Are you saying, I'm trying to go back to where you were just a little bit before. Are you saying, depending on how the reader wanted to take the ending, it was either okay and everything was fine, or, there was still so many things you could think about? |
| S8-2 | Confirm | Gerrick: | Yes. |
| S7-3 | Expand | Betsy: | It's happy. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-16 | Orchestrate<br>Check | T: | But, Gerrick, do you agree that it was happy? |
| S8-3 | Clarify<br>Expand | Gerrick: | It depends. I started thinking about, I thought it was happy, when like I just finished the book, and I didn't think anything about it. Then when I started thinking about it, I just started thinking, it's just like, this is one, just like in a chess game, you took over one piece, they didn't win the whole game yet. They just won a little part of it. |
| T-17 | Orchestrate | T: | Darren, what did you want to say? |

Segment #4: Power in their reputation. The fourth, very short segment involves just one student. Darren is responding to Gep's idea in the first segment that Lisa's gang is not vulnerable to the Chicago Gang, but he is also introducing the new idea that Lisa's gang now has a reputation which will help to protect them. The teacher again clarifies his idea by restating it.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #4

Segment #4: Power in their reputation

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S9-1 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Present | Darren: | I agree with Gep, because it's when they beat Tom Logan's gang, I mean I wouldn't want to go and mess with them people again. I wouldn't like, run into them, because they're trouble. They're strong enough to beat Tom Logan's gang. |
| T-18 | Restate | T: | So if you knew about their reputation, and you knew they had beaten Tom Logan, you wouldn't go... |
| S9-2 | Confirm | Darren: | I wouldn't mess with them. |
| T-19 | Orchestrate | T: | Jimmy? |

Segment #5: Gun vs. verbal confrontation. Once again, as in each segment so far, a new participant introduces a new topic. Jimmy has internalized the teacher's pattern of clarifying the students' points so far and does not wait for her to finish her statement. Instead, he restates (S10-2) his idea himself. She then asks for further clarification, and he expands his statement into a more specific statement. This triggers a thought for Betsy and she is able to verbalize more adequately for herself why she is dissatisfied with the ending. She says, "I just figured out why...." Gerrick also sees connections with what has been said before and refers back to what Sheila said in segment #2. The teacher's only involvement in this is, as before, to just recognize turn-takers and clarify ideas through restatement.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #5

Segment #5: Gun vs. verbal confrontation

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S10-1 | Present<br>Expand | Jimmy: | It wasn't really warring it, with Tom Logan and all. Tom Logan was standing there with a gun, and he could have blew Lisa's head off right there. But he, but because of what Lisa was saying, he'd realized what he was doing, and he put the gun down and left. |
| T-20 | Restate | T: | So it wasn't... |
| S10-2 | Clarify | Jimmy: | It wasn't because of war, it wasn't like guns and everything. |
| T-21 | Restate | T: | You're saying it wasn't what the children did then? |
| S10-3 | Confirm<br>Expand | Jimmy: | Yeah, it was, she just came in and talked to him, and he actually dug into himself and found out that it was true what she was saying. |
| T-22 | Restate | T: | So Jimmy's saying it wouldn't <u>be</u> the reputation of the children in the city, because <u>they</u> didn't really defeat Tom Logan. He's saying Tom Logan defeated himself. |
| S10-4 | Confirm | Jimmy: | Yeah. |
| T-23 | Orchestrate | T: | Betsy? |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S7-4 | Recycle<br>Expand | Betsy: | Well, I think I just figured out why I didn't like the ending. Because it was too easy. It was like she beat him verbally instead of, they didn't really, they didn't like have a big fight, and then all the kids are going, "Oh yeah." |
| S? | (uncodable) | Girl: | (unidentifiable) She...tells...(inaudible) |
| S7-5 | Disagree<br>Expand | Betsy: | No she didn't It's like she hasn't done anything, I mean, she's done a lot, but she didn't really, you know, it was sort of more a verbal thing than more like, blood and guts. |
| T-24 | Restate | T: | So you're unhappy because she beat him verbally. |
| S7-6 | Confirm<br>Expand | Betsy: | Yeah, and it's not something you, I mean I sort of expected it, but it was sort of disappointing, you know. Like, built up to this big battle and then nothing happens, and everyone's cheering for her and you're like... |
| S8-4 | Agree<br>Expand | Gerrick: | It's sort of like what Sheila said of Lisa's perfect mind kicking in and talking and thinking the ideas over. |
| T-25 | Orchestrate | T: | All right, Don, did you want to comment on that one? |

Segment #6: Lisa's accomplishment coupled with the dragging on of the story. Once again, in segment #6, a new participant introduces yet a new topic for consideration. Don begins by linking into and agreeing with what Betsy has just said about being disappointed that the big battle, which was expected, did not occur. The verbal victory was not expected and was seen by Betsy as "nothing happens." Then Don goes further with what else did not happen, which Lisa had hoped to accomplish. This engages the next three participants in an exploration and expansion of this topic. Jane (S13-1) refers to the text to support her statements. This is the first use of the text during this discussion.

The teacher continues to clarify by restatement or questions, and to recognize participants. Her one other conversational turn was to help (T-26) by supplying information about the issue of a possible sequel when it was raised by Don, and to focus (T-26) the students on the book "forgetting" the sequel.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #6

Segment #6: Lisa's accomplishment coupled with the dragging on of the story

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S11-1 | Agree<br>Present<br>Expand | Don: | I agree with what Betsy says. And I also think that the ending didn't really accomplish what Lisa had, like Lisa wanted the electricity back, and she wanted all these advancements. And they never really happened, everyone knows there's a sequel and that other things are gonna happen, but... |
| T-26 | Help: Tell<br>Help: Focus | T: | It hasn't been published, it hasn't been published, but it does say there's one in process, but go ahead, forgetting that, let's just go with what you said. |
| S11-2 | Expand | Don: | She kind of like, when she got Glenbard back, she kind of accomplished something, but not all that she set out to do. And it wasn't really a good image. |
| T-27 | Restate | T: | Because she didn't accomplish what she set out to do? |
| S11-3 | Confirm | Don: | Yeah. |
| T-28 | Orchestrate | T: | Marissa? |
| S1-3 | Recycle<br>Expand | Marissa: | Well I felt that in the third part it just kept going on and on and on, and everybody, you know, they tried to get the city back, and they lost it, and then they tried again and they lost it again. And then at the end, they got it back, but nothing else happened, and that's why I was disappointed. Like, you know, like they didn't, Lisa didn't accomplish everything she wanted to, and now everybody thinks Lisa is so wonderful, and the author really does make it seem like she is at the end. And they're all gonna look up to her, and I don't think there's going to be any more problems cause they're gonna do whatever she tells them to, guard the place, so... |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-29 | Orchestrate | T: | Ann? |
| S12-1 | Agree<br>Expand | Ann: | I agree with Marissa. It keeps dragging on at the end of the story or, you might think they're like adopted, they're doing what she tells them to do. |
| T-30 | Orchestrate | T: | Jane, you wanted to say something. |
| S13-1 | Expand | Jane: | (Book in hand) In the book it says that, she even admits that she didn't earn the city back. I mean, somewhere in here it says I didn't earn the city back, so she's admitting that she didn't really do it her way. Like she won, but she wasn't satisfied with it. |
| T-31 | Restate<br>Orchestrate | T: | So you think that even at the end of the story, Lisa isn't even satisfied at this point. All right, Kent? |

Segment #7: Author rushed the ending. This new topic turns from the ideas in the end of the story to how the end of the story was written. It is initiated by a student and expanded by another student. The teacher continues only to clarify and orchestrate turn-taking.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #7

Segment #7: Author rushed the ending

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S6-5 | Present | Kent: | I feel that the author kind of rushed the end of the story. He dragged on the whole story, you read it and get tired of everything, then at the end he sort of whizzed by the ending. |
| T-32 | Restate | T: | You think he failed there? |
| S6-6 | Clarify<br>Expand | Kent: | I think he got tired of the story. I can't say I blame the guy. (Laughter from a few.) |
| S12-2 | Expand | Ann: | (Can't be heard but the teacher hears, and Ann repeats it below.) |
| T-33 | Orchestrate | T: | (To Ann) Like he didn't do what? |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S12-3 | Expand | Ann: | Like he's building a mountain and he didn't put the top on. |
| T-34 | Orchestrate | T: | Ann just said, in case you didn't hear it, it was like he was building a mountain, but he didn't put the top on it. |
| S6-7 | Orchestrate | Kent: | I didn't get to put my top on it. |
| T-35 | Orchestrate | T: | All right, you want to finish. Go ahead. |
| S6-8 | Expand | Kent: | Well I feel that when he wrote it, he was doing really good, then at the end he sort of rushed everything, like he left you hanging and everything. He rushed it. I sometimes get that way when I write my stories too. I get tired of the story. |
| T-36 | Restate | T: | So Kent you feel, you almost had a sense that he was writing the way some of us write at times when we get tired of what we have and we just want to end it. |
| S6-9 | Confirm Expand | Kent: | Yeah. He wanted to end it, but he wasn't at the point of ending it, so he just rushed through it. |
| T-37 | Orchestrate | T: | Samantha? |

Segment #8: (Recycle) Power to the winners, Segment #9: (Recycle) The verbal confrontation, Segment #10: Ending is boring, goes on and on, Segment #11: Ending is unexpected. The next four segments represent a mulling over of topics which have been previously discussed or alluded to. The students recognize they are rapidly changing the topic and this is seen in phrases such as "this is another point now" (S14-1), "this is sort of out of it, but" (S2-6), and "this doesn't have anything to do with what [the previous person said]" (S5-2). They are repeating and adding to what has been said before and tend to be more expansive in their explanations. Conrad is looking for confirmation in the text (S3-3) and drops out of the discussion while he does so.

The teacher ups the ante during segment #10, when she asks them to "talk about why" (T-44) and to look at what Lisa is at the end of the story. Help is offered in her summary (T-44) of what has been said about the confrontation involving Lisa at the end of the book and in her focusing (T-44) upon the character of Lisa through a series of questions to think about. Responses to this scaffolding are not seen until segment #12, where Gerrick talks about Tom Logan and Lisa, and in subsequent segments, especially segment #20 where changes in Lisa are discussed.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENTS #8, #9, #10, #11

Segment #8: (Recycle) Power to the winners

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S14-1 | Agree<br>Recycle | Samantha: | This is another point now, but I agree with Gep, about what he said if someone messes with him and the other person wins, that person is not gonna go back and mess with him again. |
| T-38 | Restate | T: | So you think power will come to the people in the city because they've established... |
| S14-2 | Clarify<br>Expand | Samantha: | They'll finally get their senses and say, well he could probably beat me again if he tried, and he won't want to be, and he won't want to have it happen, put in the effort. |
| T-39 | Restate<br>Orchestrate | T: | So it's a reputation kind of thing, a fear of reputation. Charlene? |

Segment 9: (Recycle) The verbal confrontation

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S2-6 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Expand | Charlene: | Well this is sort of out of it, but I agree with Jimmy, when he said that Lisa beat Tom Logan with words. She didn't duke it out in the parking lot or something, but what she did, she found his weak spot. She knew when she hit it, and she just kept working at it. And it worked. As you can tell, because he left. And I think that sort of like the best way to hit it, because, well I'm not one for fighting outright. I don't like violence that much. But, I think that Lisa did good, she was just talking to him. Even when he put back the gun, she didn't take it, because she knew she hit the weak spot, and she knew that she could get him out of there if she just kept talking and it worked. |
| T-40 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila? |

Segment 10: Ending is boring, goes on and on

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S5-2 | Recycle<br>Expand<br>Present | Sheila: | This doesn't have anything to do with what Charlene said, but I think one of the reasons that I really didn't like the ending was because it just sounds like, the whole story was Lisa had a great idea, Lisa had the people, and they go out and they got in trouble. Lisa had another great idea, and it just kept going on and on and on and it was kind of like, no matter what happened you know that everything would turn out okay for the time being, and if anything bad would happen again, and it's just kind of like, boring. |
| T-41 | Orchestrate | T: | Okay, Conrad you had your hand up for a while. |
| S3-2 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Expand | Conrad: | For the first time I agree with Kent. The story rattled on. In the last part, okay, it seemed like he kept the story going just for the sake of going. He didn't seem to say anything. He could have said the whole end of the story in one sentence. He just kept going on. |
| S6-10 | Expand | Kent: | Like he was chasing he tail and he stopped. |
| T-42 | Restate | T: | Let's go over, you're unhappy with the ending. |
| S3-3 | Confirm<br>Expand | Conrad: | Yeah. It just kept going and going. In the third part...(picks up a book) |
| T-43 | Orchestrate | T: | Why don't you make your point. Go ahead. (Conrad is looking for something in the book.) All right, let's go to Cora, she had her hand up, and then we'll go to some other people and come back to Conrad. |
| S15-1 | Expand | Cora: | I agree with the ending was just, was sort of off, it was okay in the middle, like in the middle was pretty good, but then at the end, it was just... |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-44 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Focus<br>Help: Summarize<br>Orchestrate | T: | (Interrupting) Well, let's see if we can talk about <u>why</u>. Let's just not say, because let's think about, let's look at Lisa at the end of the story. And we, Charlene and people, I can't think of who else said it was verbal, who was the person who said it was verbal? (Students help) It was Betsy, all right, that it was verbal confrontation. Charlene, Betsy said she didn't like that. That's what she didn't like about the ending of the story. And Charlene said she felt that was a good way to do it. She could manage it. Think back to what Lisa <u>is</u> at the end of the story. (Pause) What kind of a frame of mind is she in? What is Lisa like at the end of the story? Betsy what do you want to say? |

<u>Segment 11: Ending is unexpected</u>

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S7-7 | Recycle<br>Present<br>Expand | Betsy: | Well I sort of agree with Charlene, but I mean, I don't like violence either, but it's sort of expected, because it was, like Sheila said, it went through the whole story, Lisa had ideas, they worked out fine, on and on and on, until she lost the city. Then she had another idea to get it back, but then it sort of failed, but then she got it back again. And it was like you didn't expect that and that's why the story didn't turn out right. |
| T-45 | Restate | T: | So you think that the author changed? |
| S7-8 | Clarify | Betsy: | Sort of tried to change it, but no one is expecting it and no one really, he tried to change the sequence, but it didn't really like, clash. |
| T-46 | Restate | T: | So as a reader, you weren't ready for the ending of the story. |
| S7-9 | Confirm | Betsy: | Yeah. |
| T-47 | Orchestrate | T: | Gerrick |

Segment #12: Tom Logan's mistakes. Gerrick begins the next segment by focusing on Tom Logan as he is with Lisa during their confrontation at the end. Both he and Jane flesh out their ideas to a greater extent than had been occurring in segments #8 through #11, where the teacher tried to help them to focus their remarks and look back to the way Lisa was at the end. The teacher continues to recognize participants and clarify ideas.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #12

Segment #12: Tom Logan's mistakes

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S8-5 | Present<br>Expand | Gerrick: | I think it's kinda like [unfair] that he lost the city. Because I remember looking at it like Lisa's sad point, but Tom Logan had just as much claim on that school building as Lisa did. I mean she didn't have her name "Lisa" carved in it. And if Tom Logan wanted to keep it his way, he shouldn't have let the people out, because I think what he has to be, he has to be a leader. Just like Lisa, he has to boss the people around, sort of, and as soon as he starts losing the people, and letting the people leave, he lost his courage. And I think that was one of the reasons he was allowed. She gave him a chance to do that verbally. Because I think the only other way was, she could have done that, is, had picked up the gun and blown away Tom Logan. I think if it weren't for he let down his defenses that way, he wouldn't have, he would of taken over Lisa total. |
| T-48 | Orchestrate | T: | Jane? |
| S13-2 | Expand | Jane: | Well I think Tom Logan was pretty stupid too, because I mean, he lost some of the supplies that he could have had, and like the shelter that everyone in his gang could have fit in. And I think he was stupid to give it up, just verbally, I mean, he could of at least fought for it. |
| T-49 | Restate | T: | You think it was a big mistake on his part, to do that? |

S13-3 Confirm Jane: Yeah.

Segment #13: Is the last part needed? This segment begins when the teacher calls on Conrad, who has been looking through the text to confirm his idea that not only is it boring, parts of it are not needed in this book and, in fact, may just be there to satisfy the author's needs for a sequel. The teacher intervenes in several ways in this segment. She recognizes Conrad and reminds the students that he has been searching for confirmation of his idea. She helps students to think further about the issue Conrad has raised by focusing (T-52) on it and calling for them to respond to Conrad's "need about what is in the end of the story." She helps to clarify what Conrad and apparently others are thinking, by modifying (T-54) the language used by Conrad to "not trusting the author" instead of "he just put that in there for, something to do with the sequel," and she again focuses (T-55) them on the book they have read rather than an unknown possible sequel.

Gerrick's contribution in this segment is a more articulate and specific version of his very first contribution (S8-1) on this day back in segment #3 where he commented upon being left "hanging just a bit, so you could let your mind wander." Here he shared how he did just that and what meaning it had for him. It illustrates his openness to not having it all nailed down and to looking at "all of the possibilities that could happen (S8-6)." He expressed the same idea in the words, "it opened the door up, so like, at the end of the story, if you wanted to carry on, you think you could (S8-6)."

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #13

Segment #13: Is the last part needed?

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-50 | Orchestrate | T: | Conrad? Conrad wanted confirmation of something at the ending of the story a few minutes back, so... |
| S3-4 | Recycle<br>Expand<br>Present | Conrad: | Okay, the only thing that he really said in the last part, was that Lisa gets better, and then she talks to Tom. And, they really, the author just kept going. He really didn't need the part about the ...(?) where she goes around to the other people, and talks about the Chicago gang, they really didn't need that. I think he was just writing for the sake of writing. |
| T-51 | Restate | T: | So you don't think there was any reason for any of that in there, when she went around? |
| S3-5 | Confirm<br>Expand | Conrad: | No. The reason they make her better, and then talk to Tom, but most of the last part |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | wasn't really needed. |
| T-52 | Invite<br>Help: Focus<br>Orchestrate | T: | Okay, anybody want to respond to <u>that</u> particular issue? Let's respond to him, his need about what is in the end of the story. Gerrick? |
| S8-6 | Expand | Gerrick: | I think, like that sort of loop around, when she went around and just checked all the places, that was sort of like make you think about Craig, when he decided to start his own farm, like the Chicago Gang and stuff like that. When I heard about that, I started to think about Craig, well wait a minute, he's got no sort of defense system, he's just living on a farm now. It sort of made me think of <u>all</u> of the possibilities that could happen. That it opened the door up, so like, at the end of the story, if you wanted to carry on, you think you could. |
| T-53 | Restate | T: | You think that loop was there to provide you with some things to think about when the story ended? |
| S8-7 | Confirm | Gerrick: | Yeah. |
| S3-6 | Expand | Conrad: | But you really didn't need to think about those things. You really had enough danger from Tom Logan's gang, and the gangs around there. They didn't really need to put the part about the gang from Chicago and stuff. I don't think, it really wasn't needed. And it was like he just put that in there for, something to do with the sequel or something. |
| T-54 | Help: Modify/ shape<br>Restate<br>Orchestrate | T: | All right, some of you are not trusting the author. You think maybe it is something for the sequel. Okay, Jimmy? |
| S10-5 | Expand | Jimmy: | When you said about the other gangs, they might need Tom Logan in the next book though. That's maybe why they didn't shoot Tom Logan. Or why she didn't pick up the gun. Because if she had picked up the gun, and shot Tom Logan, that means in the next |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE 

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | book, if the other gang had come... |
| T-55 | Help: Focus | T: | Well, even without the next book, in the future,... |
| S6-11 | Check | Kent: | Wait, how do you know he's going to write a sequel? |
| S10-6 | Expand | Jimmy: | If the gangs had come, and had blown away the other gang, and they had kids left, that other gang comes and wipes them out, and all that's left is like 20 kids from this building, and they're just there. And, then they wouldn't be able to do anything, because if they did have Tom Logan's gang, it would be a lot easier for them. |
| T-56 | Orchestrate | T: | Ann? |

Segment #14: (Recycle) Verbal defeat or welcome alternative?, Segment #15: (Recycle) Author rushed the ending. The next two brief segments contain only one turn each. They illustrate, however, how students are listening and thinking throughout the discussion. This is Ann's first contribution, and while she claims she is "going back," she is actually moving the discussion forward by expanding the recycled idea beyond what has been said before and raising the new issue of Tom's defeat being a welcome alternative. Darren refers way back to Kent in segment #7 (S6-5,6,7,8,9). This is the first turn he has had since Kent's remarks about the way the author rushed the ending of the book, but he has kept Kent's ideas in mind and adds his personal response about the ending of the book to Kent's argument.

The teacher's only function here is to recognize turn-taking.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENTS #14 AND #15

Segment #14 (Recycle) Verbal defeat or welcome alternative?

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S16-1 | Recycle<br>Expand<br>Present | Ann: | Well I, I'm going back,...(?) Tom Logan, I don't think, there's more of what Lisa did before than what she did right then to talk him out of it. Cause I think he was sick of the city. He didn't know how to run it, and no one would listen to him, and I don't think he wanted to do that. So when she offered him an alternative to leave, I think he was more than happy to go. |

Segment 15: (Recycle) Author rushed the ending

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S9-3 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Expand | Darren: | I agree with Kent, because when the author writes near the end of the book, he didn't like want to write anymore. Like when I read the book, I don't want to read the end of the book, so I just read it real quick, and he just wrote real quick because he wanted to get it over with. |
| T-57 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila? |

Segment #16: Lisa should have died. In this segment, students speculate on what they would have learned about the children and Tom Logan if Lisa had died. In doing so, several threads are woven into their exploration of possibilities. Marissa (S1-5) brings the issue of the depiction of Lisa as so perfect and all-knowing, addressed in segments #1, #2, and #6, back into focus and joins it to the exploration of possible alternative ways the author could have ended the book. Kent (S6-13) alludes to another story and speculates about how this story might have had a similar plot which would offer similar opportunities for understanding the characters.

The teacher does no more than continue her role of orchestrating turn-takers and clarifying ideas with students.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #16

Segment #16: Lisa should have died

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S5-3 | Present<br>Expand | Sheila: | I think it was great. Although it might have been better, if they didn't have Lisa live. I think it could have been better if Lisa had died, and you could see what kind of city the other kids would have. And if they could actually survive without someone to tell them what to do. |
| S1-4 | Agree | Marissa: | Yeah. |
| T-58 | Orchestrate | T: | Okay, Marissa, go ahead. |
| S1-5 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Expand | Marissa: | I don't think Lisa should have lived either, because she's like they made her look so perfect and everything. She had the ideas and everything. So it would have |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | been better if you could see <u>how</u> the children lived without her. Oh, everything is fine now, Lisa is back, you know, we're fine with Lisa. |
| T-59 | Orchestrate | T: | Kent? |
| S6-12 | Expand | Kent: | Okay, I forgot what I said. Okay, now I know. You know the time when he was about to waste her, when he shot her, he could have shot her again without thinking. |
| T-60 | Check | T: | When he picked the gun up you mean? |
| S6-13 | Confirm Expand | Kent: | Yeah. And he shot her. Well if he shot her, if he killed her, that would have been perfect, because like at that moment I was like comparing him to this Rambo episode (loud speaker interruption). Like in Rambo, when his girlfriend gets killed, and everything. I was sort of thinking that maybe she would get killed, and see how, like Rambo has to survive and everything, without her. And, I was wondering how the kids would survive, I'm agreeing with Sheila at this one time, God knows why. And I feel, I would like to know how the kids would survive without her. And if Tom Logan <u>did</u> waste her, how would he work without her there, could he take over the city, and everything? |
| T-61 | Check | T: | Do you think that Lisa's death would have an impact on how he might function, too? Is that what you're saying? |
| S6-14 | Confirm Expand | Kent: | Yeah, 'cause he's always arguing with her. And without her, he'd probably even die a few times. She helped him for a few times. |
| T-62 | Check | T: | All right, do you think that Tom <u>needs</u> Lisa <u>too</u> in some respect? |
| S6-15 | Clarify | Kent: | Not anymore. |
| T-63 | Orchestrate | T: | Gep? |

Segment 17: (Recycle) Happy ending or not?, Segment 18: Responsibility. The next two very brief segments are related in that they connect to a pivotal interaction involving the teacher. She challenges an idea (T-64) in a way she has not done up to this point by questioning the idea that the ending is happy. Her challenge involves upping the ante, by directly questioning Gep's position, and then providing help, in the form of a hint by pointing to an incident which is not very happy. She elicits two different responses. Gep's response is the more obvious response and is a repetition of ideas that have already been expressed. Kent's response is more perceptive and involves the broader perspective of the whole book and addresses the topic of responsibility for one's actions. It also addresses the request of the teacher, back in segment #10, to look at what Lisa is like at the end. Kent has done this, and, further, he has considered what led up to the situation Lisa finds herself in at the end.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENTS #17 AND #18

Segment #17: (Recycle) Happy ending or not?

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S4-5 | Expand<br>Recycle | Gep: | Well I think the reason they didn't shoot Lisa, is because they had to have a handy, little happy, tidy ending story. |
| S6-16 | Expand | Kent: | Like those nursery rhymes. |
| S4-6 | Agree | Gep: | Yeah. |
| T-64 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Hint | T: | Let me ask you, if it really is such a happy ending, because at the end of the story, Lisa is asking a lot of questions, like why do they need me? The children are out in the hall and they're calling for Lisa, and Lisa is saying, "why don't they understand, why are they calling on me,..." |
| S4-7 | Expand | Gep: | Because they all respect her, and think she knows everything. |

Segment 18: Responsibility

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S6-17 | Present<br>Expand | Kent: | She started it when she, she started it when she started helping them. She should have, with her actions, she should have followed with the responsibility, and she knew in the beginning when she would give them popcorn and soda, that it was gonna eventually lead up to this, because she was giving them all the popcorn and telling |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | them to do all this stuff and everything. I mean she's responsible for her actions. |
| T-65 | Restate | T: | So she didn't follow through and make the children assume some responsibility. |
| S6-18 | Expand | Kent: | Well if she thinks they're just gonna leave her alone in bed, well, she's brain dead. |
| T-66 | Restate | T: | Okay, so you think this is Lisa's responsibility she has to assume as the results of her own actions. |
| S6-19 | Confirm | Kent: | Yeah. |
| T-67 | Orchestrate | T: | Let me go to Conrad. |

Segment #19: (Recycle) Lisa, die or not, in relation to purpose and meaning. Kent's contribution in segment #18 had brought what Lisa is like at the end of the story back into focus. At the beginning of segment 19 Conrad recycles (S3-7) the idea of whether Lisa should have died or not, then he adds a new dimension by considering the purpose and meaning of the story. This sparks a debate with Sheila who addresses the idea that the death of Lisa would not have to change the meaning of the story and also joins the recycled issue of realism to the consideration of what the purpose and meaning of the story is.

Teacher involvement during this segment includes two instances of upping the ante (T-68 & 69) on Conrad, to elicit an extension of his intended ideas concerning the destruction of the purpose of the story and the meaning of the story. Both of these questions are successful in drawing Conrad out.

The last teacher turn in this segment shows the teacher struggling with whether to interject a question into the discussion or to allow the students to continue to lead the discussion. When asked later about what was going on in her mind at this time, the teacher said:

> I think I was thinking, "No, don't say it, because you're going to interject something into the discussion and impose my thinking on the discussion." I think it had to do with Sheila wanting Lisa dead, at the end of the story. I think the question I wanted to ask was, "What do you think might have happened to the children if Lisa had died?" But I thought, "Let someone else respond, don't become the controlling force." I stopped myself, let them lead the discussion. The "Yeah" may have been to give me time to think, I don't think it was agreement. I realized I may be too involved. Kent at the end is really addressing the issue I wanted them to address, what kids would do without Lisa, or without adults present.

Supporting Barbara's comments, the "Yeah" on the tape of this transcript is said as if just receiving Sheila's contribution and is spoken in a lowered voice. The fact that the teacher does not affirm or approve anyone's contribution, but remains neutral throughout the rest of the discussion, also supports this interpretation.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #19

Segment #19: (Recycle) Lisa, die or not, in relation to purpose and meaning

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S3-7 | Recycle<br>Present<br>Expand | Conrad: | I kind of have mixed feelings of what Sheila says. It would be interesting to see how the children survived without Lisa, but it kind of destroys the purpose of the story, because she's the main character. If you kill off the main character, it's like really disappointing. |
| T-68 | Upping the ante | | T: Why? |
| S3-8 | Expand | Conrad: | It kind of destroys the meaning of the story. |
| T-69 | Upping the ante | T: | What would you say was the meaning of the story? |
| S3-9 | Expand | Conrad: | Like the way Lisa lives and stuff. It's really about Lisa, and Todd, and the other people are just in there to help them survive. And if you kill Lisa, then it'll be destroying the story kind of. Because he builds it up and up, and then it's like just a fall. |
| T-70 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila? |
| S-5-4 | Expand<br>Recycle | Sheila | I don't think it would destroy the story, or any story if the main character dies. I mean, I've never read a story with an ending like that, and I've always wanted to, because it's more realistic that way, because some of the things that Lisa went through, you wouldn't think she would live. |
| T-71 | Upping the ante, ABORTED<br>Orchestrate | T: | Yeah. How do you? (Pause.) I'm going to let somebody else go. Gerrick. |

Segment 20: Has Lisa changed? Segment 20 is the longest segment of the transcript on a sustained consideration of one topic. It comprises approximately 25% of the total transcript. A look at participation patterns shows that this segment represents a sustained effort involving a large proportion of the class. Twelve of the seventeen students who participate in the total discussion contribute to this segment. Only one of these twelve makes her initial contribution during this segment. Two of the five students not participating in this segment contribute in the segment which follows, but because the topic is changed by the first one to speak, they are included in a different segment.

The teacher functions here in a manner consistent with how she has functioned so far in this discussion. She orchestrates turn-taking and clarifies ideas by restatement or by questions containing a restated idea. There are only two other kinds of teacher interaction in the entire segment and they both contain a very low level of help. The first is really part of an attempt to clarify Betsy's idea that Lisa felt she did not earn the city, where the teacher modifies (T-82) what Betsy is saying a bit in her question for clarification by using the idea of "questions" which Lisa is having. The second interaction is similar in that the teacher asks Sheila a question for clarification (T-92) that uses the word "consciously" instead of Sheila's words "she was trying not to" (S5-5), which may or may not be what Sheila had in mind when she used those words.

The students, likewise, function in this segment in a manner consistent with how they have functioned so far in this discussion. They are in control of this segment and determine the direction it takes. They are talking to each other and not to the teacher. During this segment there are two instances of statements of disagreement with specific students (S17-1, S2-7), 10 instances of students agreeing with or affirming other students, and four challenges by students of the thinking of other students (S3-10, S2-8, S7-10, S7-13).

This give and take among the students affects how several people modify their positions. Candy, who has been quiet until this time, disagrees with Gerrick and Jane, and takes the position that Lisa did not change because, as Candy said, "I don't think you can wake up and say, I want to change the way I think" (S17-1). Charlene concedes that one can't just decide to change, but disagrees with Candy and reasons that Lisa has been thinking things over and has seen that she needs to change the way she has been functioning, because she is concerned about everyone's safety. Conrad (S3-10) then engages Charlene in a debate over the lack of need to be afraid over things which are a part of life and can't be controlled. Between them they negotiate a mutual understanding by challenging each other and each conceding to part of the other's view. Charlene continues (S2-9) by expanding her idea that Lisa's position didn't change overnight, as Candy assumes. It was a gradual realization in the interim since she was shot, and that is the reason Lisa did not want to go out and talk to the children at the end. Conrad spontaneously interrupts her at this point and agrees, and Candy, who had said Lisa did not change, now says (S17-3) that Lisa's talk with Craig was the thing that changed Lisa, and that Lisa knows there is opposition to the way she is running things and therefore doesn't want to face the children. Charlene modifies her view to include what the others have said (S2-11) by voicing the idea that there is something in all the things that are being shared by her statement, "Maybe it could be a compound of all those things...." Except for a brief clarification with Candy (T-75) near the beginning of this exchange (S17-1), the teacher is not involved at all as the students talk among themselves, resulting in Candy, Conrad, and Charlene modifying their positions and understandings.

The students continue to push at their understandings of the character of Lisa by exploring further what Lisa was saying and feeling. Gerrick (S10-8) contributes to this by focusing on a passage from the text in which Lisa talks about her mistake, her need to "earn it all back", and to figure out a way to do that. His expansion on this focuses on the idea that Lisa is without an easy idea and that this is different for her. It also raises the question of what it is that she wants to "earn back." Betsy picks up on this and in several turns challenges the group to consider other possible ways to think about what Lisa is saying. She raises the possibilities that Lisa may not "want it all back," (S7-10), might not feel she had earned the city back (S7-12), might be questioning her own powers because she beat Tom too easily with words (S7-10, S7-12), and that Lisa may not really "own" the city as before (S7-13). Betsy's challenges appear to move several students along. Jane speculates that the changes in Lisa were the result of the opportunity to get away from the others and to think things through (S13-5). Sheila, Annette, and Marissa all take up the issue of Lisa's varying perspectives on the ownership of the city (S5-5, S16-2, S1-6). And Jimmy (S10-7) and Marissa (S1-7) address Lisa's realization of her own limitations.

One turn by Darren (S9-4) appears to be off-topic, yet it does not have the effect of changing the course of the discussion and initiating a new segment. In this turn, he is agreeing with Sheila's idea from segments #16 and #19, and thus recycling the notion that Lisa should have died. This is the first turn Darren has had since Sheila initiated the topic in segment #16. (Many other students are also waiting their turns.) There is a connection to the segment's topic, in that the students are working through their perceptions of Lisa's ideas and feelings, in reference to their perceptions that there is a change in her near the end of the novel, and Darren is wondering what would be different if Lisa were not there to contribute her ideas. In the next turn, Cora combines both the segment's topic concerning Lisa's change, and Darren's recycling of the notion that a different ending might offer some insight into how the children could function without Lisa's ideas.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #20

Segment #20: Has Lisa changed?

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S8-8 | Present<br>Expand | Gerrick: | I don't know if Kent has any truth to what he said about, like she's, sort of like, brain dead, I think he said that means sarcastic, but, maybe something did happen, maybe she has a difficult time in the book, I don't know, like maybe she thinks a little differently ever since she got shot, she says, "Wait a minute, I made a mistake, now, I hadn't been thinking of discipline, maybe I should change the way I think, so I won't make another mistake." |



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-72 | Restate | T: | So you think Lisa changed, and maybe she changed because she was shot? |
| S8-9 | Confirm | Gerrick: | Yeah. |
| T-73 | Invite Orchestrate | T: | Anybody else think? All right, what are you saying, Jane? |
| S13-4 | Expand | Jane: | I thought maybe it knocked some sense into her. I mean, she can't run everyone's life. I mean, the ...(?) survive for themselves, she can't do it all. |
| T-74 | Orchestrate | T: | Candy. |
| S17-1 | Disagree Expand | Candy: | I want to disagree with Gerrick. You can't wake up one morning and say I'm gonna change the way I think. I don't think you can wake up and say, I want to change the way I think, and just have a whole different personality then. |
| T-75 | Check | T: | So you don't think she changed? |
| S17-2 | Confirm | Candy: | No. |
| T-76 | Orchestrate | T: | Charlene. |
| S2-7 | Disagree Expand | Charlene: | Well, I'm disagreeing with you, just because, because like I agree with you that you can't just wake up one morning and say I'm gonna change. But I think when she got shot she realizes that she was doing something wrong, and she's gotta <u>start</u> to change it. And it could be like over that period of time when she had to lay on the couch forever and ever, that could have been going like subconsciously in her mind. Saying, that, "Well, I made a mistake, what if I make another mistake?" That could be like at the ending when she's saying why do they want me? What if I make another mistake? What if I get us all killed? That could be like why she's so scared at the end to go out and talk to all these people. She might be afraid she's gonna get them <u>all</u> killed. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S3-10 | Challenge | Conrad: | But that's like a part of life. |
| S2-8 | Agree<br>Challenge | Charlene: | Yes. But I think, I mean, aren't you afraid, like if you were in this position, wouldn't you be afraid that you had all these people's lives right in your hands. Wouldn't you be afraid? |
| S3-11 | Agree<br>Expand | Conrad: | Yeah, but, you don't really have to be afraid of making mistakes and stuff, because it's always a part of life, and it's gonna happen, even if you try to make it <u>not</u> to, it's only gonna happen. |
| S2-9 | Expand | Charlene: | I think the bullet wound, it wasn't an overnight thing that happened to her, knocking some sense into her, but I think it did sort of change her. Because you could tell just by the way she thinks. Because I think before that she hadn't gotten shot, she would have been very glad to go out and see those people and talk to them, and tell them all about her great idea. And I think, |
| S3-12 | Agree | Conrad: | (Interrupting) Yes. I agree. |
| S2-10 | Expand | Charlene: | (continuing) it's changed her frame of mind, however so little, it <u>has</u>. |
| T-77 | Orchestrate | T: | Candy, you want to respond to that, cause you... |
| S17-3 | Expand | Candy: | Well I think, I think Craig is like, telling that she, she's being a jerk, running everything. I think <u>that's</u> what sort of changed her. When they told her they don't like the way they're running it, that's when she decided to, that's what I think, she decided not to go out there and talk to them. |
| S2-11 | Agree<br>Expand | Charlene: | Maybe it could be a compound of all those things. Again, those things that keep eatin' at ya and all of a sudden it's just, it's ya come <u>at</u> it. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-78 | Orchestrate | T: | Okay, let's go over to Gerrick and then to Betsy, and I've got people on either side of me. Gerrick? |
| S10-8 | Expand | Gerrick: | It says right here, (Reads.) "Then Jill told Lisa about what had happened that day. 'Well,' Lisa said, 'sometimes one mistake is all it takes. I suppose, in a way, if I could make a stupid error like that, I deserved to lose the city. You've got to be smart to earn good things. And even that's not enough. You've got to be smart to keep them, too....' After a long pause, she said, 'I guess I'll just have to earn it all back. I'll figure something out.'" She had never had to figure something else out. The ideas just pop in her head. Like she'll tell Todd a good-night story, and then all of a sudden ideas start popping in her head, just like popcorn, and now all of a sudden she doesn't have an idea, and she wants an idea. So I think she has changed. |
| T-79 | Restate | T: | You think she has changed because now she has to work harder to do it? |
| S8-11 | Confirm | Gerrick: | Yeah. |
| T-80 | Orchestrate | T: | All right, Betsy? |
| S7-10 | Agree<br>Challenge<br>Expand | Betsy: | Well first, I sort of agree with Gerrick. Because I see what Lisa's saying, okay? She said she has to earn it all back, but do you think she said that just because she beat Tom Logan just with words, and not really want it all back? When I read that, I thought that she had a sense that she didn't earn the city back, that it was too easy for her, (students interrupting) |
| S8-12 | Clarify | Gerrick: | This was before, this was right after she gets shot. |
| S7-11 | Agree | Betsy: | I know! |
| T-81 | Orchestrate | T: | Let her finish her point, let her make her point, she's gotta, let's see what she has |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | | | to say. |
| S7-12 | Expand | Betsy: | So I had a feeling that she wasn't, she only talked about earning things, and I had the feeling she didn't, she felt she didn't earn the city by just talking to Tom Logan and him leaving. |
| T-82 | Check<br>Help: Modify/ shape | T: | Is that why she's having some questions at the end? |
| S7-13 | Confirm<br>Challenge | Betsy: | Yeah, but I want to ask people if they think she really owns the city now? Or whether she really (several students talking at once)... |
| T-83 | Orchestrate | T: | All right, Jane, you wanted to say something. |
| S13-5 | Expand | Jane: | Well it was about the farm and what had made her change. I think a little bit of peace and quiet and not being around other people, and not having to think about all their problems, really changed her. |
| T-84 | Restate | T: | So you don't think it was the shooting? You don't think it was... |
| S13-6 | Clarify | Jane: | I kind of think it was the shooting, because that gave her the opportunity to get the peace and quiet from other people. |
| T-85 | Restate | T: | So it's getting away from the people and the demands of the other people? |
| S13-7 | Confirm | Jane: | Yeah. |
| T-86 | Orchestrate | T: | Okay. Darren? |
| S9-4 | Agree<br>Recycle<br>Expand | Darren: | I agree with Sheila, because she should have got shot, because I would have liked to see how all the other people would survive without Lisa there to make all these nice ideas, and defeat Tom Logan, and stuff like that, how they would live. |
| T-87 | Orchestrate | T: | Cora? |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S15-2 | Agree<br>Expand<br>Recycle | Cora: | I agree with Jane about the thinking sort of made her change, and also that Craig told them that he didn't like it, when she's, running stuff and I think those two things and the shooting had to do it, because she got shot, and then she had time to think. I think it would have been interesting to see how the story would have ended if she had been shot and died. |
| T-88 | Orchestrate | T: | Jimmy? |
| S10-7 | Agree<br>Expand | Jimmy: | I'm agreeing with Candy (and others), because like, being shot, because she was, because she made a mistake, she was shot, because she was becoming too protective of what she had. She had so much and she was becoming too protective and didn't want to let it all go. So she, when she went down, she knew that she made a mistake by going there, because she had been becoming too protective. She wanted everything to be picture perfect, and she knew it wasn't gonna be. |
| T-89 | Check | T: | Did she know that at the time, or was that something she knew later? |
| S-10-8 | Clarify | Jimmy: | Something she knew later. |
| T-90 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila? |
| S5-5 | Expand | Sheila: | I don't really think that Lisa changed that much. I mean she changed a little bit, because like when she said, when she was talking to Craig, when she referred to the city as our city, but then after Craig talked to her, then she referred to it as my city. But, think she changed a little bit, but I think that maybe she was trying not to. |
| T-91 | Restate | T: | You don't think she wanted to change at all? |
| S5-6 | Confirm | Sheila: | Yeah. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-92 | Check<br>Help: Modify/ shape | T: | Do you think she was consciously trying not to change? |
| S5-7 | Clarify | Sheila: | I don't know, maybe, it just seemed like there was a beginning of a change and then it just sort of, ended, and she was, Lisa. |
| T-93 | Orchestrate | T: | Annette? |
| S16-2 | Agree<br>Expand | Annette: | I am agreeing with those kids, but a, when things were going well, she called it my city, and when Lisa got into trouble and...(?) with the , with all the...(?), she called it our city. It's just something I... |
| T-94 | Orchestrate | T: | Marissa? |
| S1-6 | Expand | Marissa: | Well, I noticed that, too, at the end of the book, it seemed like she didn't really want to own the city, and then in the middle of the book, she was making it very clear that it was her city. So. |
| T-95 | Check | T: | Is that another change? That she seems not... |
| S-1-7 | Confirm<br>Expand | Marissa: | Yeah. I think when she got shot, it was like, wait a second, I can't control all of these people. I got shot. |
| T-96 | Orchestrate | T: | Kent? |

Segment #21: Not the way a normal young person would react. Kent opens the next segment with a question to the students and a statement of what his response to that question would be. The teacher responds with a direct challenge (T-97) to Kent's idea in the form of a question which hints at or indirectly tells Kent what the teacher thinks. This is the only such challenge where the teacher interjects her own ideas in this whole discussion. Kent only partly concedes the teacher's point and the teacher backs off. Instead, she ups the ante (T-98) by asking Kent to state his point and then assists him in focusing (T-99) and stating his point. The teacher's next interaction is also uncharacteristic of this discussion. She tells Kent what he has done, i.e., made a point. When she does this, Gep appears to assume the teacher is trying to verbalize the point itself, as she has done in her numerous clarifications of students' ideas throughout this discussion, and he breaks in and does it for her (S4-8) and adds on to Kent's ideas. Kent then continues to offer an expansion of his ideas (S6-24).



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #21

Segment #21: Not the way a normal young person would react

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S6-20 | Present<br>Expand<br>Challenge | Kent: | Finally. If she, okay, let's put you in Lisa's position, before this all started happening, before she came in power or anything. And even if you're a boy, then you're a boy-girl. But say that everybody, all the parents died. What would you do? Would you do what she did? Party, ya, party all year, that's what you'd do, you'd party. |
| T-97 | Challenge<br>Help: Hint | T: | Isn't that what some of the children did at the very beginning? |
| S6-21 | Agree<br>Expand | Kent: | At the very beginning, but not really, because they got a bunch of candy, they stood in the house eating candy all day. |
| T-98 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Focus | T: | So what are you saying Kent, what is your point? |
| S6-22 | Expand | Kent: | We'd probably get beer, women, and everything. |
| T-99 | Help: Focus | T: | Kent, but what is your point, the point you're saying, are you saying then, see, you're telling us things, but not the... |
| S6-23 | Expand | Kent: | I'm telling you that we wouldn't do any of this stuff that they're doing, it's not realistic. |
| T-100 | Help: Tell | T: | Okay. That's your point. Your point is... |
| S4-8 | Restate<br>Expand | Gep: | They wouldn't be doing it this way. The thing is, they wouldn't a, after a couple of months, a lot of people would still be in shock. Not shock, but, they wouldn't be doing the smart thing. |
| T-101 | Restate,<br>ABORTED | T: | All right, so you think, Okay... |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S6-24 | Expand | Kent: | The first thing they'd say, take the car out, you know? |
| T-102 | Restate | T: | All right, so you're saying, the two of you are saying, this isn't the way it would be. This isn't the way the average person would react to this situation. |
| S6-25 | Confirm | Kent: | Yeah. |

Segment #22: Teacher's summary. (Final segment.) The final segment consists of just one turn in which the teacher tells the students that she must stop them. She summarizes for them the major issues they have addressed, and indicates that they will have the next day to consider them and any other issues anyone may want to bring up about the ending of the story. These are the major topics which the students recycled throughout this discussion, and they include the ending, realism, and changes in the character Lisa. The thrust of the teacher's message to the students is that their discussion is both ongoing and open.

CODED TEXT OF SEGMENT #22

Segment #22: Teacher's summary

| Turn | Purpose | Speaker | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-103 | Orchestrate<br>Help: Summarize | T: | I have to do something. I have to stop you. (Moans and groans.) Tomorrow we still have, we still have a question about realism. Kent brought it back again. We have a question about changing. We still haven't finished that. And if there's anything anyone else wants to say about the ending of the story. Because, we've talked about the ending, we've talked about change, and we've only touched on Jimmy's issue of realism. Thank you. |

**Patterns Across Topics**

The next steps in the analysis consisted of examining the patterns across the whole discussion to note consistent ways in which the teacher and the students functioned: who had control, what instructional concerns guided the teacher's orchestration and interventions, and what evidence there was to indicate that students' understandings were being questioned, changed and refined -- and how this occurred. Patterns included issues of participation and control, the purposes behind classroom talk, and the nature of the instructional scaffolding.

Starting and Ending the Discussion

From beginning to end, this discussion is focused on and shaped by the questions and concerns of the students themselves. The teacher begins with one brief, open, nondirective question which leaves the initial topic of discussion up to the students. She opens the class discussion by asking, "Okay, do we have something that we want to talk about today?"

The students then launch into their own agendas. Ownership of the day's topics is assumed by the students without being negotiated with the teacher. Four students participate before the teacher contributes anything other than recognizing turn-taking by saying the students' names. When she does say more, it is to ask, "You don't believe that that's gonna happen?" to verify a student's idea, and then she listens as the student continues to clarify and extend his/her point. Even then, she only restates the student's ideas to again verify them, and then allows another student to proceed with no question or prompting from her.

The ending also occurs with the students' concerns as the critical focus. After the teacher restates the point two students are making, she signals the end of the discussion, summarizes the topics they have discussed, and indicates that these are not resolved and will be addressed again along with any other issue anyone may have in the next class. She uses language which indicates that the issues are the students', for example, "Kent brought it back," "Jimmy's issue," and "anything anyone else wants to say."

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-102 | Restate | T: | All right, so you're saying, the two of you are saying, this isn't the way it would be. This isn't the way the average person would react to this situation. |
| S6-25 | Confirm | Kent: | Yeah. |

Segment 22: Teacher's summary

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-103 | Orchestrate<br>Help: Summarize | T: | I have to do something. I have to stop you. (Moans and groans.) Tomorrow we still have, we still have a question about realism. Kent brought it back again. We have a question about changing. We still haven't finished that. And if there's anything anyone else wants to say about the ending of the story. Because, we've talked about the ending, we've talked about change, and we've only touched on Jimmy's issue of realism. Thank you. |

Thus, although the teacher is the first and last voice, opening and ending the lesson, the students' concerns are at the heart of the entire discussion; they both set and participate in the lesson's agenda.

## Control of the Discussion

Control of the direction of the discussion is assumed by the students from the very first student to participate until the teacher stops them at the end of the class. As Table 1 indicates, 21 of the topical segments (all but the last) are initiated by the students. It is important to note that the topic of the first segment was determined by the first student to speak in response to the teacher's open invitation, and that the final segment is comprised only of the teacher's summary and her ending of the class. Therefore, all of the topics under discussion were initiated by the students.

The teacher regulates turn-taking and frequently clarifies what students are saying by restating or questioning, but in this discussion does not share her own ideas, with the exception of one very brief hint near the end of the class (T-97). When the teacher intervenes, she does so only to encourage the students to address a more difficult task (upping the ante) and to provide students with help. She never intervenes to take control of the discussion.

The students are not only in control, they are talking to each other and not to the teacher. They do not expect the teacher to initiate topics or give them guidance in the direction the discussion should take. They are, instead, quite sensitive to their peers and to whether they are responding to issues currently under discussion, are responding to an issue brought up previously, or are changing the topic. They signal this by their language and in doing so, converse among themselves. For example, in the following, Samantha both changed the topic and referred back to a previous issue:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S14-1 | Agree<br>Recycle | Samantha: | This is another point now, but I agree with Gep, about what he said if someone messes with him and the other person wins, that person is not gonna go back and mess with him again. |

In another example, the teacher is only involved in orchestrating turn-taking and in very briefly clarifying a point. The students are not discussing with the teacher but among themselves, and the teacher drops out of the verbal exchange altogether for a while. (See middle section of coded segment #20, above, for their verbatim comments.)

## Participation Patterns

Participation in this class is summarized in Table 3. Students are listed in the order in which they joined the discussion. Seventeen of the 26 students present in class on this day participated. Fifteen people speak during the first half of the transcript. Most of those with

Table 3

Percent of Turn-Taking in the Literature Discussion
(Students listed in order of appearance in the transcript)

| Position | Name | Number of turns | Percentage of total student turns (N=130) | Percentage of total turns (N=233) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Marissa | 7 | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| 2 | Charlene | 11 | 8.5 | 4.7 |
| 3 | Conrad | 12 | 9.2 | 5.2 |
| 4 | Gep | 8 | 6.2 | 3.4 |
| 5 | Sheila | 7 | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| 6 | Kent | 25 | 19.2 | 10.7 |
| 7 | Betsy | 13 | 10.0 | 5.6 |
| 8 | Gerrick | 12 | 9.2 | 5.2 |
| 9 | Darren | 4 | 3.0 | 1.7 |
| 10 | Jimmy | 8 | 6.2 | 3.4 |
| 11 | Don | 3 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 12 | Ann | 3 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| 13 | Jane | 7 | 5.4 | 3.0 |
| 14 | Samantha | 2 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| 15 | Cora | 2 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| 16 | Annette | 2 | 1.5 | 0.9 |
| 17 | Candy | 3 | 2.3 | 1.3 |
| Total student turns | | 130 | 100.0 | 55.8 |
| Total teacher turns | | 103 | | 44.2 |

higher percentages of turns entered the discussion during the early part of the class and continued throughout.

The students sit with their hands raised at various points in the discussion, but they wait for the teacher to recognize them. This is done to facilitate the logistics of turn-taking, so that people can be heard, and both the students and the teacher participate jointly in the group effort to manage this very lively discussion. Only one student felt his efforts to be heard had been cut off by the teacher's orchestration of turn-taking and interjected his desire to be heard so that he could finish the presentation of his ideas (S6-7).

This is a remarkable picture of student involvement given the fact that this is a heterogeneously grouped 7th grade class. Table 3 portrays the relative involvement of the students and the teacher. Student comments comprise 55.8% of the total turns in this class compared to the teacher's 44.2%. The comparison of total number of words spoken by teacher and students indicates that 78.8% of the words were the students', showing that, on average, the students' turns were much longer than the teacher's. The teacher's words comprised only 21.2% of the transcript indicating that overall she said little and listened a lot. In addition, as mentioned earlier, the students initiated 21 of the 22 topical segments. Taken together, we see a classroom far different from the typical one where the teacher's talk dominates. (See Marshall, 1989 for a description of class discussion that follows the more traditional pattern.)

*The Purposes Behind the Classroom Talk*

Examination of the purposes identified in the interactions provides a way to understand how the students and the teacher function in their turns in ways that make this discussion work. Table 4 lists the frequencies and percent occurrence of the purposes of turns in the transcript. Each turn contains one or more purposes. Definitions of the categories are presented in Table 1.

*The Role of the Teacher*

The teacher assumes the role of supporter of the process of understanding, through her involvement in the discussion as the orchestrator of the event, the clarifier of student meanings, and the helper and supporter of student attempts at more difficult tasks.

The Teacher as Orchestrator

Teacher turns most frequently involve orchestrating the discussion. In 54.4% of her turns, the teacher is involved in regulating turn-taking. This is usually accomplished by simply recognizing students who are indicating they want to participate. In a few instances, it involves reminding people to wait their turns and to go one at a time. The predominance of this role as orchestrator is accentuated even more in the fact that facilitating turn-taking is the sole purpose of 42.7% of this teacher's total turns.

Table 4

Percent of Turns Containing Identified Purposes

| Speaker's purpose | Number of teacher turns | Percentage of total teacher turns (N=103) | Number of student turns | Percentage of total student turns (N=130) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Agree | 0 | 0.0 | 24 | 18.5 |
| Challenge | 1 | 1.0 | 10 | 7.7 |
| Check | 9 | 8.7 | 1 | 0.8 |
| Clarify | 0 | 0.0 | 10 | 7.7 |
| Confirm | 0 | 0.0 | 25 | 19.2 |
| Disagree | 0 | 0.0 | 6 | 4.6 |
| Expand | 0 | 0.0 | 92 | 70.8 |
| Help | 17 | 16.5 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Invite | 4 | 3.9 | 0 | 0.0 |
| Orchestrate | 56 | 54.4 | 1 | 0.8 |
| Present | 0 | 0.0 | 17 | 13.1 |
| Recycle | 0 | 0.0 | 19 | 14.6 |
| Restate | 30 | 29.1 | 1 | 0.8 |
| Upping the ante | 7 | 6.8 | 0 | 0.0 |

When viewed on the videotape, the teacher is seen taking note of hands that go up in response to what students are saying. She writes down names and uses them to call on students. In this way, she appears to be sensitive to the ferment of ideas that are developing, and sometimes orchestrates students responding to each other as she did with Candy:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S2-10 | Expand | Charlene: | (continuing) it's changed her frame of mind, however so little, it has. |
| T-77 | Orchestrate | T: | Candy, you want to respond to that, cause you... |

The teacher's four open invitations for the members of the class to participate, signal both openings for and support of student involvement.

Discussion opener:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-1 | Invite<br>Orchestrate | T: | Okay, do we have something that we want to talk about today? All right, Marissa. |

Inviting other points of view:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-14 | Invite<br>Orchestrate | T: | Is that, do you agree? Does anybody have a different feeling about the ending? Gerrick? |

Inviting response to a particular issue:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-52 | Invite<br>Help: Focus<br>Orchestrate | T: | Okay, anybody want to respond to that particular issue? Let's respond to him, his need about what is in the end of the story. Gerrick? |

Inviting similar responses:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-73 | Invite<br>Orchestrate | T: | Anybody else think? All right, what are you saying, Jane? |

Functioning in this manner, as the orchestrator who invites and facilitates participation, the teacher supports the involvement of students in the active process of working through their understandings of the novel, and teaches them the rules of participation in the process.

## The Teacher as Clarifier of Student Meanings

The next most frequent purpose underlying the teacher's interactions is the clarification of student contributions. She does this in two ways. In 29.1% of her turns she uses a restatement of a student's ideas. This takes the form of either a statement or a question which con-

tains the teacher's understanding of what the student has said. In the second method of clarifying the student's ideas, the teacher asks the student for clarification more directly, in order to check out her understanding. In this discussion the teacher does this in 8.7% of her turns. In both of these ways of clarifying student meanings, the teacher is verbalizing for herself as well as for the whole class to hear. The expectation that the student will accept or alter the verbalization offered is implicit in the teacher's action and occurs as a matter of course in this class. In every case, the students either confirm or clarify their ideas. When confirmation is not verbal, there is eye contact and nonverbal acceptance of what the teacher has said. It is also important to note that these restatements never contain the teacher's ideas or additions. They are concise, earnest attempts to make what the student meant clear to all.

The Teacher as Helper and Supporter of Student Attempts at More Difficult Tasks Undertaken on Their Own or with the Teacher's Prompting

In this role the teacher takes some very specific steps to help to move the students along in their understandings. In 16.5% of her turns she offers some form of assistance or scaffolding aimed at getting them to tackle tasks they are having difficulty accomplishing. In some instances, these tasks have been set by the students themselves in the course of their discussion. In other instances, the teacher has upped the ante by asking them to deal with broader or deeper considerations than they are addressing. She does this in 6.8% of her total turns, and, as will be seen in the discussion of the role of the student, this is a very effective way to elicit expansion of student thought. Sometimes the students are able to handle these tasks without help, but when upping the ante involves asking them to accomplish tasks which push at the limits of their abilities, she offers help and makes it possible to accomplish with assistance what they may not yet tackle on their own. In either case, the five kinds of help she offers look similar. Table 5 gives the percentages of turns containing the identified kinds of help. Each of them will be discussed individually.

(1) Focusing. Help in the form of focusing or narrowing the field of consideration was the most frequent kind of help given. It occurred in 44.4% of the 17 turns containing help. The effect of such focusing is to simplify the task by limiting the scope of what needs to be attended to, so that the students' efforts focus more directly on refining their own responses. One example of this is when the students get stuck in their conversation by the possibility of a sequel being written to this book. The teacher focuses Jimmy on the book they have read rather than speculating about a possible sequel.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| S10-5 Expand | Jimmy: | When you said about the other gangs, they might need Tom Logan in the next book though. That's maybe why they didn't shoot Tom Logan. Or why she didn't pick up the gun. Because if she had picked up the gun, and shot Tom Logan, that means in the next book, if the other gang had come... |

Table 5

Percent of Turns Containing Identified Kinds of Help

| Kind of Help | Number of turns | Percentage of total turns (N=17) | Percentage of turns containing "upping the ante" (N=7) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Focus | 8 | 44.4 | 42.9 |
| Hint | 2 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Modify/shape | 3 | 16.7 | 0.0 |
| Summarize | 2 | 11.1 | 14.3 |
| Tell | 2 | 11.1 | 0.0 |
| Help of any kind | | | 71.4 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-55 | Help: Focus | T: | Well, even without the next book, in the future,... |

In the following example, the teacher has upped the ante by asking Betsy to go beyond just stating her opinion, to stating her reasons. She then provides immediate help by focusing on what it was that bothered Betsy. Betsy then begins to articulate what bothered her.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S7-1 | Agree<br>Expand | Betsy: | I sort of agree with Sheila, because the end is like, unreal, okay? Unreal. I'm not gonna say anything. |
| T-13 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Focus | T: | Why? What bothered you about whether it was realistic or not? |
| S7-2 | Expand | Betsy: | I really don't know. But it's like, oh wow, what are you supposed to do now. Oh we're happy, it's like... |

In another example, to elicit further ideas on an issue under discussion and to focus the students upon that issue, the teacher called for responses to that issue only. While the teacher offers help in focusing here, she keeps to the students' topic, and her, "Let's respond to him," keeps the ownership of the discussion with the students.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-51 | Restate | T: | So you don't think there was any reason for any of that in there, when she went around? |
| S3-5 | Confirm<br>Expand | Conrad: | No. The reason they make her better, and then talk to Tom, but most of the last part wasn't really needed. |
| T-52 | Invite<br>Help: Focus<br>Orchestrate | T: | Okay, anybody want to respond to that particular issue? Let's respond to him, his need about what is in the end of the story. Gerrick? |

(2) Modifying or shaping. In this form of help, the teacher changes the ideas of the student slightly by using different language than the student has just used, or by adding something which tightens the argument or point the student wishes to make. The intent is to elicit an alteration in the perceptions or ideas on which the student is working. This occurs almost 17% of the time. When Sheila suggests that a character was trying not to change, the teacher checks to see if she understands Sheila's view, but she also shapes what she thinks she is hearing by altering the words which Sheila used. When the teacher uses the word "consciously," Sheila appears to question her own idea and indicates she is not sure.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S5-5 | Expand | Sheila: | I don't really think that Lisa changed that much. I mean she changed a little bit, because like when she said, when she was talking to Craig, when she referred to the city as our city, but then after Craig talked to her, then she referred to it as my city. But, think she changed a little bit, but I think that maybe she was trying not to. |
| T-91 | Restate | T: | You don't think she wanted to change at all? |
| S5-6 | Confirm | Sheila: | Yeah. |
| T-92 | Check<br>Help: Modify/ shape | T: | Do you think she was consciously trying not to change? |
| S5-7 | Clarify | Sheila: | I don't know, maybe, it just seemed like there was a beginning of a change and then it just sort of, ended, and she was, Lisa. |

(3) Hinting. In an effort to elicit expected or possible responses, the teacher used hints or bits of ideas or answers. She did so 11% of the time. In the example which follows, the teacher ups the ante by asking Gep and Kent to reconsider the view that the ending of the story is happy. She then provides help in the form of a hint which points to one place in the book which indicates that things are not very happy.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S4-5 | Expand<br>Recycle | Gep: | Well I think the reason they didn't shoot Lisa, is because they had to have a handy, little happy, tidy ending story. |
| S6-16 | Expand | Kent: | Like those nursery rhymes. |
| S4-6 | Agree | Gep: | Yeah. |
| T-64 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Hint | T: | Let me ask you, if it really is such a happy ending, because at the end of the story, Lisa is asking a lot of questions, like why do they need me? The children are out in the hall and they're calling for Lisa, and Lisa is saying, "Why don't they understand, why are they calling on me,..." |

(4) Telling. The teacher sometimes used the explicit statement of information for the purpose of establishing it as a given (11% of the time). In this discussion, two instances of telling occurred. One established the fact that the author had indicated that a sequel to this book was in progress, but had not been published.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S11-1 | | Don: | (at the end of one of his turns)...didn't really accomplish what Lisa had, like Lisa wanted the electricity back, and she wanted all these advancements. And they never really happened, everyone knows there's a sequel and that other things are gonna happen, but... |
| T-26 | Help: Tell<br>Help: Focus | T: | It hasn't been published, it hasn't been published, but it does say there's one in process, but go ahead, forgetting that, let's just go with what you said. |

The second instance of telling occurred when the teacher labeled one of Kent's turns as "your point" to distinguish it from just a list of "things."

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-98 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Focus | T: | So what are you saying Kent, what is your point? |
| S6-22 | Expand | Kent: | We'd probably get beer, women, and everything. |
| T-99 | Help: Focus | T: | Kent, but what is your point, the point you're saying, are you saying then, see, you're telling us things, but not the... |
| S6-23 | Expand | Kent: | I'm telling you that we wouldn't do any of this stuff that they're doing, it's not realistic. |
| T-100 | Help: Tell | T: | Okay. That's your point. Your point is... |

(5) Summarize. The final form of help given by the teacher is to review or restate ideas which have been stated before by a number of people in order to bring them to everyone's attention. This is done twice during this discussion. In the first instance, the teacher ups the ante and asks the students why they have the positions they do about the end of the story. This move occurs during a time in the discussion when they seem to be stalled and represents an attempt to move the students on to aspects of the ending of the story other than those they are

addressing. To accomplish this, she uses two forms of help. She narrows their field of consideration by focusing them on the character of Lisa at the end of the story, then summarizes the positions which students had taken previously on issues relating to a major event near the end involving this character. She then continues to focus their attention even further on what they think about Lisa in the ending, her frame of mind and what she is like:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S15-1 | Expand | Cora: | I agree with the ending was just, was sort of off, it was okay in the middle, like in the middle was pretty good, but then at the end, it was just... |
| T-44 | Upping the ante<br>Help: Focus<br>Help: Summarize<br>Orchestrate | T: | (Interrupting) Well, let's see if we can talk about why. Let's just not say, because let's think about, let's look at Lisa at the end of the story. And we, Charlene and people, I can't think of who else said it was verbal, who was the person who said it was verbal? (Students help) It was Betsy, all right, that it was verbal confrontation. Charlene, Betsy said she didn't like that. That's what she didn't like about the ending of the story. And Charlene said she felt that was a good way to do it. She could manage it. Think back to what Lisa is at the end of the story. (Pause) What kind of a frame of mind is she in? What is Lisa like at the end of the story? Betsy what do you want to say? |

The second instance of summarization concludes the whole discussion and reviews the topics of the discussion.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-103 | Orchestrate<br>Help: Summarize | T: | I have to do something. I have to stop you. (Moans and groans.) Tomorrow we still have, we still have a question about realism. Kent brought it back again. We have a question about changing. We still haven't finished that. And if there's anything anyone else wants to say about the ending of the story. Because, we've talked about the ending, we've talked about change, and we've only touched on Jimmy's issue of realism. Thank you. |

Both of the summaries serve to set the students up for further thinking and discussion, one during the class, and the other on the following day.

### Significant Omissions in the Teacher's Interactions

None of the contributions made by the students are evaluated. The teacher simply receives them and indicates a desire to understand. She does not participate in the exchange of ideas and does not expand ideas for the students, or introduce topics for discussion. The seven instances of upping the ante build on topics already under consideration and serve to move the students along to assuming more difficult tasks. The students did not always take up the more difficult task when it was presented, as for example when the teacher asked them to look at how the character of Lisa was at the end of the book, but the teacher did not push them or intervene as the students continued on with <u>their</u> agenda.

Reinforcement and reassurance are not given overtly, but there certainly is an acceptance and acknowledgment of the students' efforts through both the calm regulation of the class, so that those who choose to speak can be heard, as well as the maintenance of the agenda for this class, which is to discuss those things which are of concern to the students in an atmosphere of openness. Further, she never calls upon students who have not indicated first that they want to participate. Her four invitations to participate are all to students not currently discussing the topic being addressed at that moment, or, as in the case of the opening invitation, to everyone, and <u>not</u> issued to prod non-participants into action. Indeed, the high percentage of teacher turns devoted to orchestration is needed because so many students have something to say.

## *The Role of the Student*

A comparison of the range of student turns with that of the teacher in Table 3 shows that the students had almost twice the number of turns. Eleven purposes have been identified in the students' turns in comparison with seven teacher purposes. Further comparison reveals that the students' role in this discussion is distinctly different from that of the teacher. The students' role is primarily to initiate, develop, and communicate ideas within the social context of their classroom, which includes their classmates' concomitant efforts and their teacher's orchestration and support. Each of these will be discussed below.

### The Students as Initiators of Topics

Students initiated all of the topics discussed on this day. Thirteen percent of the students' turns contained a presentation of a new topic and 14.6% of the students' turns contained the reintroduction of a previously discussed topic. This picture is indicative of the control the students have of the agenda and the direction of the discussion. As has been noted above, the teacher never determines the topic of discussion; she only helps them to focus upon and extend their understanding of the topics which they have introduced.

The Students as Developers of Ideas

In this role, the students' interactions have several purposes: to expand ideas, to clarify ideas, to challenge ideas, and to recycle ideas into further discussion.

(1) Expanding ideas. Expanding ideas is the predominant activity of the students during this discussion. During these times, students are building and extending ideas which they have introduced or which are already being considered. In this discussion, students extend their ideas in 70.8% of the students' turns. Most of these expansions, 73.9% of the total expansions, occur as the students contributed freely to the discussion, answering and addressing each others' ideas. These are not voiced in response to teacher prompting or questions designed to elicit expansion (Table 5). This indicates that the students are capable of expanding their own ideas without explicit prompting. It also indicates that underlying the classroom context is the belief that students are capable thinkers and the expectation that they will use this time to explore ideas and construct meaning for themselves.

Of the remaining 26.1% of the expansions that are prompted by teacher turns, 6.5% occur in response to the teacher upping the ante, 4.3% occur in response to teacher help which does not accompany upping the ante, and 15.2% occurs as a part of a student's response to teacher efforts to secure clarification. In the last instance, the students move beyond merely confirming or correcting what the teacher has said, to expanding their original ideas. This occurs in a little over one-third of the teacher's clarification efforts.

Upping the ante elicits the highest rate of response containing expansion with 85.7% of the students' efforts to respond to the more difficult task presented by the teacher with an expansion. Table 6 summarizes student responses to the teacher's prompts. (Clarification efforts are coded "restate" and "check".)

The following example contains several instances of student expansion of ideas. The first instance occurs as a matter of course as Conrad recycles the issue of having the main character die and introduces the issues of purpose and meaning in the story. The next two occur in response to the teacher upping the ante, and the fourth occurs in response to Conrad, not to a teacher prompt.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-67 | Orchestrate | T: | Let me go to Conrad. |
| 53-7 | Recycle<br>Present<br>Expand | Conrad: | I kind of have mixed feelings of what Sheila says. It would be interesting to see how the children survived without Lisa, but it kind of destroys the purpose of the story, because she's the main character. If you kill off the main character, it's like really disappointing. |
| T-68 | Upping the ante | T: | Why? |

Table 6

Percent of Student Responses to Teacher Prompts Containing Expansion

| Teacher prompt | Number of teacher turns | Student Responses: Number containing student expansion | Percent containing student expansion | Percent of total student expansions (N=92) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Restate | 30 | 10 | 33.3 | 10.9 |
| Check | 9 | 4 | 44.4 | 4.3 |
| Subtotal: | 39 | 14 | 35.9 | 15.2 |
| Upping ante | 7 | 6 | 85.7 | 6.5 |
| Help without upping ante | 11 | 4 | 36.4 | 4.3 |
| Total: | 57 | 24 | 42.1 | 26.1 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S3-8 | Expand | Conrad: | It kind of destroys the meaning of the story. |
| T-69 | Upping the ante | T: | What would you say was the meaning of the story? |
| S3-9 | Expand | Conrad: | Like the way Lisa lives and stuff. It's really about Lisa, and Todd, and the other people are just in there to help them survive. And if you kill Lisa, then it'll be destroying the story kind of. Because he builds it up and up, and then it's like just a fall. |
| T-70 | Orchestrate | T: | Sheila? |
| S-5-4 | Expand<br>Recycle | Sheila | I don't think it would destroy the story, or any story if the main character dies. I mean, I've never read a story with an ending like that, and I've always wanted to, because it's more realistic that way, because some of the things that Lisa went through, you wouldn't think she would live. |

(2) Clarifying ideas. The second most frequent type of student interaction is confirming. In 19.2% of all student turns, students accept the restatements of their ideas voiced by the teacher. This is due to the high frequency of the teacher's efforts to clarify students' ideas. The significance of this activity is that the student retains ownership of the ideas and is given the opportunity and the responsibility of making them clear to all. When changes need to be made, students clarify, as these students did in 7.7% of their turns.

In the following example, the teacher is attempting to clarify Betsy's ideas using two restatements. Betsy clarifies her position after the first restatement, and confirms the teacher's second restatement.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S7-7 | Recycle<br>Present<br>Expand | Betsy: | Well I sort of agree with Charlene, but I mean, I don't like violence either, but it's sort of expected, because it was, like Sheila said, it went through the whole story, Lisa had ideas, they worked out fine, on and on and on, until she lost the city. Then she had another idea to get it back, but then it sort of failed, but then she got it back again. And it was like you didn't expect that and that's why the story didn't turn out right. |



62 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-45 | Restate | T: | So you think that the author changed? |
| S7-8 | Clarify | Betsy: | Sort of tried to change it, but no one is expecting it and no one really, he tried to change the sequence, but it didn't really like, clash. |
| T-46 | Restate | T: | So as a reader, you weren't ready for the ending of the story. |
| S7-9 | Confirm | Betsy: | Yeah. |

(3) Challenging ideas. Students directly challenge each other on specific points 7.7% of the time. This is in direct contrast to the teacher who only challenges one student near the end of the discussion (T-97).

In the very first segment, Marissa, the first student to speak, takes a position which is immediately challenged by Charlene. Conrad and Gep are rapidly drawn into the discussion, one on either side of the issue.

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S1-1 | Present<br>Expand | Marissa: | I didn't like the ending. I thought it was like too perfect. Like she gets the city back and everything's just peachy dandy. I thought something else would happen. It just didn't feel right. |
| T-2 | Orchestrate | T: | Charlene? |
| S2-1 | Disagree<br>Expand<br>Challenge | Charlene: | When you said peachy dandy, it's not peachy dandy, there are tons of problems that she's got to face. I mean, she's got, the problem, what if the gang comes back? |
| S1-2 | Expand | Marissa: | Well, Tom Logan's a wimp! |
| S2-2 | Expand<br>Challenge | Charlene: | Well, you've got to think about it, because when they were going around doing all this other stuff, they heard mention of this other gang called the Chicago Gang I think it was, and what if that gang comes? I mean, they're very, they've got a lot of problems. It's not perfect, nothing is perfect by all means. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-3 | Orchestrate | T: | Conrad? |
| S3-1 | Agree<br>Expand | Conrad: | I agree with Charlene, that it's not really perfect, it is kind of a happy ending, because everyone is all fine. But they are, there's other problems, like, they still have the food problem and all the gangs and stuff, they're kind of use to it, but it's still, it's still a big problem, and it's gonna take a long time to get over this, to get over that problem. |
| T-4 | Orchestrate | T: | Gep? |
| S4-1 | Expand | Gep: | It is a too happy, perfect, it's like they have problems, but they don't have that many problems, like the Chicago Gang doesn't really have that high of a chance of coming. |

An especially important challenge was made by Kent near the end of the discussion. The class had discussed the issue of the realism of the book on previous occasions and they were still bothered by this during this discussion. Kent faces the issue squarely in this exchange, and asks a penetrating question which serves to help him articulate his own ideas (S6-23). Gep then does this also (S4-8).

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| S6-20 | Present<br>Expand<br>Challenge | Kent: | Finally. If she, okay, let's put you in Lisa's position, before this all started happening, before she came in power or anything...But say that everybody, all the parents died. What would you do? Would you do what she did? Party, ya, party all year, that's what you'd do, you'd party. |

In the next few turns, the teacher helps Kent to articulate the point he is trying to make. After several exchanges she asks:

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| T-99 | Help: Focus | T: | Kent, but what is your point, the point you're saying, are you saying then, see, you're telling us things, but not the... |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

S6-23 Expand — Kent: I'm telling you that we wouldn't do any of this stuff that they're doing, it's not realistic.

When the teacher is slow to restate Kent's point, Gep does it in his own words:

S4-8 Restate Expand — Gep: They wouldn't be doing it this way. The thing is, they wouldn't a, after a couple of months, a lot of people would still be in shock. Not shock, but, they wouldn't be doing the smart thing.

(4) Recycling ideas into further discussion. Recycling is a part of the students' efforts to connect, rethink and refine ideas which are brought up. This occurs in 14.6% of the student turns, and it reflects how they are linking and relating the ideas as they progress in their interpretations of the story. Two striking examples of this exist. Below, Betsy joins the issue of the ending of the story to the unexpected verbal victory of Lisa over Tom in the story:

S7-4 Recycle Expand — Betsy: Well, I think I just figured out why I didn't like the ending. Because it was too easy. It was like she beat him verbally instead of, they didn't really, they didn't like have a big fight, and then all the kids are going, "Oh yeah."

In the second example, Marissa couples the old issue of the dragging story with the new topic of Lisa's accomplishments:

S1-3 Recycle Expand — Marissa: Well I felt that in the third part it kept going on and on and on, and everybody, you know, they tried to get the city back, and they lost it, and then they tried again and they lost it again. And then at the end, they got it back, but nothing else happened, and that's why I was disappointed. Like, you know, like they didn't, Lisa didn't accomplish everything she wanted to, and now everybody thinks Lisa is so wonderful, and the author really does make it seem like she is at the end. And they're all

gonna look up to her, and I don't think
there's going to be any more problems
cause they're gonna do whatever she tells
them to, guard the place, so...

The Student as a Socially Aware, Sensitive Peer in Discussion

In this discussion, students pay close attention to each other's ideas. This is reflected in the extent to which they agree and disagree with each other. In 18.5% of their turns, they are agreeing with or affirming other students' ideas, and in 4.6%, they are disagreeing. Taken together with the students' direct challenges to each other, 30.8% or almost one-third of their turns involve taking positions in relation to those of their peers. This reflects the manner in which the students address each other and not the teacher. They affirm, confront, and question each other in ways very different from the ways the teacher functions in relation to them. Further, they do not directly question the teacher nor do they look to the teacher to answer their questions.

Recycling appears to be partly needed because so many students want to speak that they need to wait their turns and the topic gets changed before they get a turn. To facilitate this, the students sometimes signal that they know they are addressing a topic out of order or name the person to whose ideas they are responding. Samantha does both of these things in the following example.

S14-1 Agree
Recycle

Samantha: This is another point now, but I agree
with Gep, about what he said if someone
messes with him and the other person
wins, that person is not gonna go back
and mess with him again.

**Discussion**

The literature lesson analyzed here illustrates how the process of understanding can develop through social interaction, and the role of the teacher is crucial in how this is accomplished. By her behaviors and her words, the teacher creates the milieu in which student thinking is elicited and valued. In this instance, the teacher is not working toward particular interpretations, but has structured the discussion so that each student's understanding is viewed as legitimate and there is room for each to alter and refine their envisionments (Langer 1989, 1990a,b, 1991) which have been evolving over a number of days based on group input and personal reflection.

It is notable that this heterogeneously grouped class containing students with differing reading levels functioned so richly. Students did not all have the same understandings or levels of insight, yet they had all read the book and were able to participate as their understandings permitted. The students who were poorer readers did not need to be given easier work or different literature. At whatever level of understanding they entered into the interaction, they could use the discussion to move themselves along to deeper understanding and to explore the possibilities of the story. In the transcript, remedial readers are indistinguishable from their

higher performing classmates.

*Instructional Scaffolding*

One way of capturing the instructional elements which contribute to the success of this lesson is to look at the ways in which it fulfills the criteria of effective instructional scaffolding put forth by Applebee and Langer (1983), Langer (1984), and Langer and Applebee (1986). The five criteria are ownership, appropriateness, structure, collaboration, and internalization.

(a) Ownership. The students are given ownership of this discussion from the very beginning of the class when the teacher opened by asking if there were things "we want to talk about today?" All of the topics of discussion from this beginning were determined by the students. Recycling of topics occurred as the students answered and questioned each other. No one is simply repeating what the teacher has said, nor is anyone trying to discover the teacher's own interpretation, which she refrains from sharing with the students. The students' sense of purpose appears to be to share and defend their points of view and to voice their changing ideas when they have them. Ownership of the discussion is clearly their own, both as they talk to each other, and as they answer teacher questions which come in response to student-owned topics and contributions. Even when the teacher pushes the students to think more deeply or to consider alternate possibilities, she only does so with student-owned topics.

(b) Appropriateness of the instructional task. The task for this class is to talk about concerns students have about the book they have been reading, so that they each may have a greater understanding of the piece they have read, and be able to share those ideas with each other. They bring a level of skill into group discussion which enables them to participate in an open way which allows for different points of view to be expressed and challenged. They also come to this discussion having had a number of other discussions on this book as the book was being read. In these respects, the task is within their ability.

For the task to be appropriate, there must also be room in the task for learning. That is, the task is of sufficient difficulty that the students can develop new knowledge and skills through the help given by the teacher or the structure of the activity. This enables them to use abilities that are in the process of maturing, but need the support of a more knowledgeable person (Vygotsky, 1978).

The task for this class is appropriate in several ways. While they seem quite tolerant of a variety of viewpoints, they are not yet mature enough just to have such a discussion without the teacher's constant intervention to manage turn-taking. Even with her, they sometimes all talk at once. Listening to others as a part of sharing and working through ideas is being learned.

Most of the students have room to learn to ask themselves the "why?" and "what?" question in exploration of the reasons behind the feelings and opinions they express. These questions and the, "Do you really think?" question are asked by both the teacher and by other students. These questions help students to think through their ideas. Hearing other points of view is also helpful to some in challenging their own ideas.

Many students have room for learning how to express themselves orally in a succinct manner, which allows for their ideas to be understood by others. The students are assisted here by the teacher's continual clarification of what the students intend to say. The teacher usually restates in one sentence what may have taken the student several sentences or more to develop, sometimes with much repetition. This modeling provides the student with an example to follow, and sometimes shows students where their original statements were inadequate or misunderstood.

(c) Structure. Structure refers to the natural sequences of thought and language needed to complete the various activities students encounter. Instructional attention to structure allows students' problem solving and reasoning abilities to develop in response to entire tasks, helping them become aware of the sequences that can be helpful in working things through. Such attention does not treat skills (neither comprehension skills nor critical thinking skills) out of the context of completing the task at hand, but when necessary, shows how they work within the purposeful activity in which the students are engaged -- in this case, reasoning about the book they have read.

In this class, Barbara helps the students reflect on and refine their own ideas. This is the primary way in which she models and supports their learning of the structure -- of the natural sequence of thought and language -- involved in responding to and discussing The Girl Who Owned a City. For example, ways to focus, modify, and expand ideas are embedded within the context of the entire lesson, permeating her contributions to the interactions in ways that help the students clarify their own understandings and concerns about the book. The teacher's efforts do not help the students think through the content alone, but also provide them with models of the natural sequence of thought and language that is immediately useful to them in enriching their understandings. In doing so, she also provides them with a useful (albeit incomplete) map of the structure of literary reasoning -- a route they can attempt in the future, when thinking through their understandings of other books.

(d) Collaboration. This component of effective instructional scaffolding involves a shared responsibility between the teacher and the students for the tasks being undertaken. The teacher's role is to participate in interactions in a manner which builds upon and recasts the students' own efforts to solve problems or complete tasks without evaluative responses or a testing of previous learning.

In this lesson, the teacher maintains a collaborative stance throughout. Her numerous clarifications of students' ideas never contain an evaluation of the students' ideas, but rather a recasting of ideas understood by both the teacher and the students to be the student's, and further, with the mutual expectation that the student will confirm or correct the teacher's understanding in line with the student's intention and meaning, and never the teacher's. This clarification process, as has been shown, has the effect of often prompting the students to elaborate or expand upon ideas and sometimes to elicit other students' responses by directly asking them questions as they continue to work upon the issues being explored.

The teacher also asks questions of a "what?" or "why?" nature that point the students to further elaboration of ideas they already have brought up themselves, but which need development. By this, she helps them to take a next step in the path they are on or to turn onto another path if they choose, but she does not dictate the choice. In like manner, she asked once that they look at the character of Lisa at the end, but she did not force them to take up Lisa as a

focus of discussion. This had the effect of pointing out another focus for thought and eventually produced productive work later in the discussion when the students were ready and took up the topic of whether Lisa had changed. Notably, the students evolved this focus on change, not the teacher, although she collaborated in getting them to look more closely at Lisa.

One of the teacher's two rare instances of telling occurred in the context of collaboration. When the students were speculating that the author of the book wrote the ending as he did to set himself up for a sequel, the teacher told those who had not read the item about the sequel in the biographical sketch of the author, that it said he would write one, but she also told them to just discuss the book and forget the possibility of a sequel. This helps them to complete their task of discussing their response to the book.

(e) Internalization. This final component of effective instructional scaffolding involves the students' internalization of the patterns and approaches which have been practiced with the teacher's assistance and external scaffolding. As the students take over more and more of the elements provided by the teacher, the scaffolding is gradually withdrawn until it is no longer needed, because the learner is using the new knowledge or skills on his own.

Specific skills which can be learned in a short time are not being taught in this class, but there is copious evidence of students' internalization of patterns and approaches to discussion learned over time which the students use and which are mutually understood by the teacher and students to be in operation, even though they are never verbalized or overtly recognized. For instance, from the very beginning, students know that they must voice their concerns and ideas and not wait for the teacher to introduce topics for them to discuss. They also automatically further their positions by supplying reasons and expansions for their ideas and answering questions they anticipate will be asked. Other approaches which the students use which are not prompted in the class by the teacher include comparison to another text, attention to how the piece was written, looking at all the possibilities without closing off avenues in the mind, addressing what the purpose and meaning of the story might be, and sharing the way their ideas are changing as the discussion proceeds without fear of rejection or judgment. The functions of their turns replicate those the teacher has modeled, and it is evidence of these behaviors that lets the teacher know the students have learned.

Further evidence of internalization is seen in the way they listen to each other, pick up on each other's ideas, and direct questions to each other. It is understood that they are talking to each other, not just to the teacher. It is also understood that the teacher will not supply topics or her ideas. No one looks to the teacher to discover what she thinks or to seek her approval. The whole class functions smoothly, through an internalization of a discussion routine they have learned, and the teacher only intervenes on several occasions to point them to deeper questions or more solid responses to each other's ideas. In a very large measure, this group of students could and does function conversationally without the teacher's help. She has, for the most part, reduced herself to "traffic controller" and allowed the students to take over the bulk of the task which they themselves set for the day.

*The Quality of Literature and the Quality of Thought*

The issue of whether the qualities of the literature are crucial to the potential benefit of student thinking and growth is of particular relevance to this study, because the novel being discussed is "adolescent literature" and can be criticized on grounds of questionable literary merit. However, as can be seen in this analysis, there was enough in this book to challenge the thoughts of these seventh-graders. The very issues which might be criticized, things such as believability, the structure of the novel, the style of the author, and desirability of sequels all became the focus of student concerns which both fueled the discussion and pushed them naturally toward greater maturity in the evaluation of the piece and literary discrimination. How do students learn these things for themselves if they only read the traditional approved canon and are told by their teachers and others who claim the authority to know, that they are good or poor pieces? This discussion provides us with a defensible argument for reading books such as this, which provide a learning experience in becoming a discriminating reader. What is even more important, in this class the students came to know the book's strengths and weaknesses for themselves.

This systematic analysis of the verbal interactions within a single literature discussion has illustrated ways in which the cultural context of this particular classroom, including the teacher's goals and behaviors, affected the ways these students functioned. Instead of retracing plot lines, searching for the interpretations they thought their teacher wanted, or analyzing handed-down interpretations, they are helped to rethink and refine their own responses that can later be compared with, argued against or even replaced by other interpretations they confront. Further, the language and purposes underlying the interactions indicate supportive ways in which teachers can function in instructional settings to enable and encourage students to grow cognitively and to learn how to think for themselves.

**References**


Applebee, A. N. (1989). The teaching of literature in programs with reputations for excellence in English (Report Series 1.1). Albany, NY: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature.

Applebee, A. N., & Langer, J. A. (1983). Instructional scaffolding: Reading and writing as natural language activities. Language Arts, 60(2), 168-75.

Alvermann, D. E. & Hayes, D. W. (1989). Classroom discussion of content area reading assignments: An intervention study. Reading Research Quarterly, 24(3), 305-335.

Barnes, D. (1976). From communication to curriculum. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Bruner, J. S., Goodnow, J. J., & Austin, B. A. (1956). A study in thinking. NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Close, E. (1990). How did we get here: Seventh-graders sharing literature. Language Arts, 67, 813-823.

Fisher, R.N. (1985). A comparison of tenth grade students' small group discussions in response to literature (Doctoral dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 47. 2062A.

Hickman, J. (1980). Children's response to literature: What happens in the classroom. Language Arts, 57(5), 524-29.

Hickman, J. (1983). Everything considered: Response to literature in an elementary school setting. Journal of Research and Development in Education, 16(3), 8-13.

Langer, J. A. (1984). Literacy instruction in American schools: Problems and perspectives. American Journal of Education, 93(1), 107-132.

Langer, J. A. (1985). Levels of questioning: An alternative view. Reading Research Quarterly, 20(5), 586-602.

Langer, J. A. (1987a). A sociocognitive perspective on literacy. In J. Langer (Ed.), Language, literacy, and culture: Issues of society and schooling (pp. 1-20). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Langer, J. A. (1987b). The construction of meaning and the assessment of comprehension. In R. Freedle and R. Duran (Eds.), Cognitive and linguistic analysis of test performance (pp. 225-244). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Langer, J. A. (1989). The process of understanding literature (Report No. 2.1). Albany, NY: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature.

Langer, J.A. (1990a). The process of understanding: Reading for literary and informative purposes. Research in the Teaching of English, 24(3), 229-260.

Langer, J. A. (1990b). Understanding literature. Language Arts. 67, 812-816.

Langer, J. A. (1991). Literary understanding and literature instruction (Report Series 2.11). Albany, NY: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature.

Langer, J.A. (in press). Literacy and schooling: A sociocognitive perspective. In E. Hiebert (Ed.), Literacy for a diverse society. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Langer, J. A., & Applebee, A. N. (1986). Reading and writing instruction: Toward a theory of teaching and learning. In Ernst Z. Rothkopf (Ed.), Review of research in education (pp. 171-194). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.

Langer, J. A. & Applebee, A. N. (1987). How writing shapes thinking. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Marshall, J. D. (1987). The effects of writing on students' understanding of literary texts. Research in the Teaching of English, 21(1), 30-63.

Marshall, J. D. (1989). Patterns of discourse in classroom discussions of literature (Report No. 2.9). Albany, NY: Center for the Learning and Teaching of Literature.

McClure, A.A. (1985). Children's responses to poetry in a supportive literary context. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 46, 2603A.

McPhail, I. P. (1979). A study of response to literature across three social interaction patterns: A directional effort. Reading Improvement, 16(1), 55-61.

Mehan, H. (1979). Learning lessons: Social organization in the classroom. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Miller, S. M. (1988). Collaborative learning in secondary school discussion of expository texts. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Pittsburgh.) Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 3647A.

Nelson, O. T. (1975). The girl who owned a city. New York, NY: Dell.

Purves, A. C. (1981). Achievement in reading and literature: The United States in international perspective. Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.

Rogoff, B. (1990). Apprenticeship in thinking. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rosenblatt, L. M. (1938). The reader, the text, the poem. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University.

Roser, N. & Martinez, M. (1985). Roles adults play in preschooler's response to literature. Language Arts, 62(5), 485-90.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1962). Thought and language. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.

Wertsch, J. (Ed.). (1985). Culture, communication, and cognition. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.